THEOLOGY

VOL. XXXIX NOVEMBER, 1939 No. 233

EDITORIAL

IT has been said that in this war we are defending a rotten citadel against aggressive hordes, and that we must defend it since that is our only hope of securing an opportunity for reconstructing it. The trouble is that, in order to defend it with unwavering conviction, we have to forget, if not to deny, its rottenness. Can we, while all our energies are bent to the task of defending it, at the same time make plans for its reconstruction? The two undertakings seem incompatible. If so, whether we win or lose the war, are we not bound again to lose the peace? And this time the failure will be even more serious. For after this war there is not the least likelihood that we shall be able to restore within the nation the *status quo*, as to a large extent we were able to do after the last war. Thus it may be misleading to say that we are defending a citadel. Our own social system has already been gravely disturbed by the necessities of organizing for totalitarian war, and changes are taking place, and will continue to take place, which can never be reversed. We referred last month to the problem presented by the centralization of executive power. That power is being used to organize the resources of the nation in the spheres of industry, finance, education, propaganda, etc., for the successful prosecution of the war. That is inevitable and necessary; even if we had agreed on a veiled capitulation after the liquidation of Poland, it is almost certain that we should still as a nation have had to continue organizing our resources for the defence of our own interests in a world in which the struggle for power, so far from being exorcized, would have been shown more clearly than ever to set the conditions for existence. Thus, whatever happens, organization for war is from the political standpoint a primary necessity in the contemporary situation.

* * * * *

The question remains: Can a nation, combine organization for war with such a reordering of its social system as will make for the eventual establishment of equal justice for all its

citizens ? It is important not to idealize the concept of equal justice. No realizable social system will embody complete equality or complete justice. On the other hand, it is obvious that our social system at the outbreak of the war, while it may have been characterized by higher material standards of living even in its depressed classes than many other nations had achieved, yet encouraged extremes of poverty and wealth which were morally intolerable and which could, in fact, have been redressed long ago if there had been a determination to carry through a policy of radical reform. Equality of opportunity may be a better criterion to apply than equal justice, for the former fixes attention on the rights and duties of persons rather than on a concept that may be regarded as merely abstract and general. Were it not for the necessity of subordinating everything to organization for war, the moment might be ripe for a fresh and concerted attempt to reorder our social system with a view to securing the nearest possible approximation to equality of opportunity. Political liberalism is plainly bankrupt; the official Labour party is a pathetic shadow of the National Government; and many of those who before the war had turned to Marxian Communism as providing a more realistic and revolutionary way to social reconstruction have had their faith rudely shaken by the Russian *dénouement*, which indeed came as no surprise to some of us. There is, in fact, in the country a great deal of perplexed and disheartened idealism, which if a lead were given might be harnessed to a realistic policy of social reconstruction.

* * * * *

It is not the province of the Church as such to give this lead directly. The province of the Church is to declare the Gospel of the Kingdom of God, which is neither a political philosophy nor a political program, but the absolute and transcendent term of all political philosophies and programs. The members of the Church, however, have to live in a political order and to take the fullest possible part in determining its character. For this purpose they need (1) to have a clear understanding of the Christian doctrine of man, for this will supply them with a criterion with which to criticize existing political structures and to propose desirable changes, (2) to master and apply the technical and specialist knowledge upon which any successful program of social change must be based, and (3) to see how

the changes that are both desirable and practicable can be put into effect, which means determining a political strategy in which non-Christians can co-operate, since there is no present possibility in a society like our own of Christians being sufficiently powerful, either in quality or quantity, to carry through by themselves a program of reconstruction. With regard to these three undertakings, the clergy as such are competent, or ought to be competent, to contribute to the first. The other two require ranges of knowledge, which only the laity can acquire or possess, and forms of action, in which only the laity can professionally engage.

* * * * *

There are in England Christian theologians and sociologists who have already envisaged the task ahead in these terms. The group of writers, who use the quarterly review *Christendom* as their organ, have done an important amount of preparatory work on these lines. Since the Oxford Conference on Church, Community and State, other groups have also been at work. But unless we are mistaken, it was generally held that it would be a long time before concerted thinking on these questions would be sufficiently advanced to justify an attempt to give its results any wide publicity or to suggest that they were ready for translation into anything in the nature of an agreed political program. The outbreak of the war and the quickening up of the process of inevitable change have, however, made it imperative that the best Christian thinking on these subjects should be made available for all who are willing to attend to it, even though it cannot yet lay claim to even approximate unanimity. The newly launched weekly Christian News-Letter[1] is intended to be a means of meeting this need, and we hope that it will secure the interest of readers of THEOLOGY. Even those who consider that at this time of day—or rather at this time of night—it is idle for Christians to suppose that they will be able to bring any decisive influence to bear on the course of social change, still need to see for themselves and to explain to others why it is idle.

* * * * *

The Bishop of Coventry in his letter, which we gladly publish, although we cannot at the moment deal at length

1 20 Balcombe Street, London, N.W. 1. Subscription rate: 10s. per annum (fifty-two issues) or 5s. 6d. for twenty-six issues.

with all the points that it raises, seems to suggest that we ought at present to be so fully occupied with the war against Germany that we ought not to try to rouse interest in the impending war on the home front. "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof." This carries us back to the difficulty with which we began. While we are sure that the nation ought to be warned that rapid transformation of our own society has begun and that the vital question is to what ends and by what means it shall be directed, yet we are not sanguine that the warning will be heeded, precisely for the reason which the Bishop suggests. We are even less sanguine that a nation which has given itself over entirely to the military enterprise will be able, when that is concluded or intermitted, to devote itself with understanding and determination to the reordering of its own social system. To be sanguine about that would involve blindness to the psychological effects of war-weariness. At the end of the war our people will naturally want to get back to the comparatively halcyon conditions which they knew before it began. Ought we not to tell them that, however much they may want to do so, there is no likelihood whatever that it will be possible, and that, even if it were possible, it would not be desirable? Certainly, if we implied last month that Christians ought to affect a detachment from, or transcendence to, the ordeal through which the nation is passing, we implied the exact opposite of what we intended. We meant that Christians ought to think through and live through the whole ordeal, and not only the more obvious, but in the long run less serious, part of it.

* * * * *

The important article by the Archbishop of York, which follows, raises a problem which, as he says, has already become acute. The present lack of understanding and sympathy between older and younger theologians is more serious than the normal divergence between older and younger generations. It is as much psychological or sociological as theological in the stricter sense. The temper and outlook of those whose minds reached maturity before 1914 generally reflect the security and hopefulness which then seemed justified. This temper and outlook were not fundamentally shaken by the 1914-18 war, and since then both the teaching of theology and the leadership and administration of the Church have been under that sort

of direction. On the other hand, the younger theologians have grown up in a world which seemed obviously subject to instability and disintegration. When they have looked for the causes of this, they have been driven to ask whether since the Enlightenment, and indeed since the Renaissance, European culture and Christian theology too have not been on the wrong lines. While the old have been busy baptizing "Liberalism" into Christianity, the young regard it as their mission to exorcize it. We do not suppose that either have a monopoly of truth or of Christian insight. The immediate need is that the two generations should get on to speaking terms, for at present the old can scarcely make out what the young are talking about, and the young are inclined to suppose that the old have no longer anything to say that is worth considering. Whether or not the Archbishop's analysis of the situation is accepted, his article is informed by the only spirit which can make possible a bridging of the gulf.

* * * * *

A remarkable illustration of the attitude of the young is Mr David Paton's book, *Blind Guides?* (S.C.M. Press, 2s. 6d.). It is ostensibly an examination of the conditions which at present prevail in the Modern Universities, but it has a much wider interest, and may well be read as a complement to the Archbishop of York's article. While Mr Paton is critical, as the title of his book suggests, of those who direct, or fail to direct, education in our universities, he has none of that naive confidence in contemporary youth which is the last straw at which elderly idealists are accustomed to grasp. Mr Paton himself, having dropped his incendiary bomb, has gone off to work as a missionary in China.

Theology To-day

It is probable that the outbreak of war will prove to have intensified a sense of divergence between older and younger theologians which, in the latter, was already acute. It is extremely important to recognize the fact of this divergence, and to do what may be possible to mitigate a tension which, in some form, may be inevitable and even wholesome. If the divergence is unrecognized, or if no attempts are made to reach mutual understanding, its results may be a loss of spiritual fellowship, and a lack of balance in both parties.

As a contribution to the "appeasement" which is desirable I am moved to attempt my own diagnosis of the situation, and to offer my own theological confession and *apologia*. I hope this may lead others, specially of the younger theologians, to do the same. Thus, in the interchange which takes place, we may be brought to a greater measure of mutual appreciation. I am sure the older, among whom I regretfully take my place, have a great deal to learn from the younger; I also think the younger are in danger of losing much, and partly spoiling their own contribution, if they so far fail to appreciate their immediate predecessors as to ignore their aim and totally repudiate their method.

No generalization about the older group would be just to all, and I propose to be shamelessly egoistic, because I am likely to avoid misrepresenting myself and might easily misrepresent others.

Some of our younger friends feel that we who reached our conclusions and settled our methods of thought in the first decade of this century have gone up a blind-alley and are now content to settle down at the end of it. But so far as we had any measure of success in our aim, we must refuse that account of our work. For a blind-alley is a road that leads nowhere, and our road led us and some others to Christ. The difficulty which many of the younger generation find about it is not that it leads nowhere, but that it starts from a place where they are not standing and to which they cannot get. I am reminded of the undergraduate who said to me in 1911 or 1912, after listening to Bishop Gore: "I could see that his mind was an awfully jolly merry-go-round, but it never stopped where I was so that I could get on."

My contemporaries grew up in a stable world. Of

course, it was not a Christian world in any adequate sense of the words. But it professed Christianity; it was so far sincere in this that it was troubled at any suggestion that it ignored Christian standards of conduct; and in fact its own ostensible standards were to a great extent a Christian heritage. The great Victorian Agnostics had thought it would be possible to retain Christian ethics while discarding Christian doctrine; and (which is more important) they wished to retain Christian ethics and took it for granted that all men of goodwill wished it also. On the ethical side we could assume acceptance of Christian principles.

Along with this went a most unChristian belief in automatic progress, which was an inheritance from the Rationalists of the eighteenth century. Christian principles provided the standard of life; education and scientific discovery would of themselves produce increasing conformity to that standard. Evil, therefore, was regarded as a survival from a passing age. There was no need for redemption, nor even for God except as the " tendency that makes for righteousness."

That situation constituted our problem. We had to do what we could to persuade people possessed of that outlook to believe that they needed a saviour, and that God is something more than a diffused essence of amiability. We had to do this in face of evidence that already the fabric of life was insecure, though only the more alert were sensitive to that evidence. There was a great industrial upheaval planned for the autumn of 1914—almost a general strike. During the previous summer, in May or early June, I consulted Bishop Gore about some action in view of it; he replied that he had no hope of doing anything useful because on the one side it was too late to check the upheaval, on the other it was impossible to make the hitherto secure classes attend to their peril; and anyhow we all deserved the judgment that was coming. [It came from without, not from within; but it came.]

We were involved in a sex-war which was already a public nuisance and was developing into a menace. We were on the brink of civil war in Ireland. And nowhere was there enough good sense or goodwill to provide a hope of that give-and-take which was needed for a solution. And the root of this obstinacy was the habit of security. No one would believe that any great evil could threaten society as we knew it. There are still multitudes of people for whom,

in spite of all to disturb them, the Victorian or Edwardian outlook is axiomatic. Consequently, the theology arising from and addressed to that outlook still has its appeal and value.

It is futile to utter proclamations or denunciations to such a frame of mind. Moreover, we were of necessity infected by it. We saw, as folk who desired to think like Christians, a little further into the meaning of our world than those who sought no illumination from that faith. We had to lead as many as we could to see life in that light of the knowledge of God, which we had ourselves received. We tried, so to speak, to make a map of the world as seen from the standpoint of Christian faith.

In my own case the preparation for this enterprise was more philosophical than theological. The teacher who most influenced me was Edward Caird. The books to which I owed most in the forming of my general outlook were *The World and the Individual* by Royce, and Bernard Bosanquet's two volumes of Gifford Lectures—*The Principle of Individuality and Value* and *The Value and Destiny of the Individual*. I never accepted Bosanquet's ultimate position, and at one time my main concern was to discover what was my point of divergence from one who carried me so far with him. All the time there was in the background the pervasive and increasing influence of Plato—especially of the *Republic*, *Phaedrus*, *Theaetetus* and *Sophist*.

With such an aim and such an approach I was concerned to lead a few members of a generation which accepted one large part of the Christian heritage to enter also on the rest. In the Preface to *Christus Veritas* I spoke of the contemporary intellectual atmosphere as "dominated by a philosophy which leaves no room for a specific Incarnation. This philosophy," I went on, "is not materialist or atheist; it is both spiritual and theistic; but the idea of God which it reaches is such as to preclude His ever doing anything in particular in any other sense than that in which He does everything in general. *I believe that a very slight touch to the intellectual balance may make the scales incline the other way.* Part of the trouble is that theologians have left the field of most general inquiry too largely to non-theological philosophers; they have tended to write either history or detailed discussion of particular doctrines. *What is needed is the exposition of the Christian idea of God, life and the world, or, in other words, a Christo-centric metaphysics.*"

The two sentences which I have italicized seem very remote to-day. The estimate expressed in the earlier was probably mistaken in 1924, when that sentence was written; it has no relevance to the situation to-day. The later sentence expresses what I believe to be a permanent need and the supreme task of theology; but it is a task of which we now see the impracticability in anything less than many generations.

In the Preface to *Doctrine in the Church of England* I tried to indicate a sense of the new needs. After mentioning that under the influence of Westcott and Gore most Anglican theology was centred upon the Incarnation, I said: "A theology of the Incarnation tends to be a Christo-centric metaphysic. And in all ages there is need for the fresh elaboration of such a scheme of thought or map of life as seen in the light of the revelation in Christ. A theology of Redemption (though, of course, Redemption has its great place in the former) tends rather to sound the prophetic note; it is more ready to admit that much in this evil world is irrational and strictly unintelligible; and it looks to the coming of the Kingdom as a necessary preliminary to the understanding of much that now is. If the security of the nineteenth century, already (1937) shattered in Europe, finally crumbles away in our own country, we shall be pressed more and more towards a theology of Redemption. In this we shall be coming closer to the New Testament."

Now we turn to the world in which the younger theologians have formed their habits of thought. Christian standards of conduct are challenged as radically as Christian doctrine. Men and women come to maturity with no sense that there is a place for them somewhere in a society resting on secure principles which it regards as Christian. There may be no discoverable place for them at all. Society rests on no ascertainable principles, but is rather in its structure an accidental resultant of blind forces, which are in process of undermining what they have produced. The Christian view of life is not only relegated to the background as unnecessary, but openly repudiated by adherents of a philosophy which is far more obviously effective than Christianity; for if a young man becomes a Communist or Fascist he is told very plainly what to think and do, whereas the Church leaves him with nothing but principles so general as to afford no actual guidance.

Meanwhile, the world has been fumbling about with a League of Nations, till its drift to another war became evident, though statesmen declared that this would be the end of civilization.

When the older theologians offer to men fashioned by such influences a Christian map of the world, these rightly refuse to listen. The world of to-day is one of which no Christian map can be made. It must be changed by Christ into something very unlike itself before a Christian map of it is possible. We used to believe in the sovereignty of the God of love a great deal too light-heartedly. I have much more understanding now than I had in 1906 or thereabout (when he said it) of Bishop Gore's passionate outburst at a meeting of the Synthetic Society: " If it were not for the miracles, and supremely the Resurrection, I should see no more reason for supposing that God is revealed in Jesus Christ than that He is revealed in Nero."

There is a new task for theologians to-day. We cannot come to the men of to-day saying: " You will find that all your experience fits together in a harmonious system if you will only look at it in the illumination of the Gospel." We may still hope that one day they will look back at their experience and see that all of it falls within the purpose of the God of Righteous Love. But that kind of theology belongs to the Kingdom which is to come. Our task with this world is not to explain it but to convert it. Its need can be met, not by the discovery of its own immanent principle in signal manifestation through Jesus Christ, but only by the shattering impact upon its self-sufficiency and arrogance of the Son of God crucified, risen and ascended, pouring forth that explosive and disruptive energy which is the Holy Ghost. He is the source of fellowship and all true fellowship comes from Him. But in order to fashion true fellowship in such a world as this, and out of such men and women as we are, He must first break up sham fellowships with which we have been deluding ourselves. Christ said that the effect of His coming would be to set men at variance. We must expect the movement of His Spirit among us to produce sharper divisions as well as deeper unity.

All this still falls formally, I think, within the formulations which we reached in the pre-war days, and which were indeed only a rephrasing of traditional Christian positions. In *Mens Creatrix* (1916) and *Christus Veritas* (1924) I argued

that evil, *when overcome*, is justified, and that no justification for any one instance of evil is possible until that evil is overcome. I still think that this formally covers the ground. But to the new generation the approach, the tone, the emphasis seem all to be wrong—so wrong that they cannot even be interested in the question whether the formula is valid. War—nothing less—overshadows life. We have to maintain our faith in God under the shadow and shock of war. Facile generalizations are an affront. We must start from the fearful tension between the doctrine of the Love of God and the actual facts of daily experience. When we have eliminated war, it will be time to discuss whether its monstrous evil can then be seen as a " constituent element of the absolute good " (*Christus Veritas*, p. 254). Till then we had better get on with the job of eliminating it by the power of the Gospel, which we must present, not as the clue to a universal synthesis, but as the source of world-transformation.

Partly for this reason, and still more because of the convergence of all lines of New Testament scholarship upon the central place of the Ecclesia in the Apostolic experience and teaching, theologians of to-day are more concerned than we were in 1910 or 1920 about the theological status of the Church. The Church is part of its own Creed. To be in Christ is to be in the Church—and *vice versa*. Hence there is a new appreciation of the importance of the Church for faith itself. In the midst of this world where it appears that the devil's claim is valid—" it hath been delivered unto me, and to whomsoever I will I give it "—the individual Christian is helpless except as a member of the Body, the Church. So the Church, alike as ground and object of faith, and as the agent of the Kingdom endowed even now with its powers, has a new prominence in the minds of thoughtful Christians. We did not fail a quarter of a century ago to insist on the necessity and claim of the Church. But this was secondary and derivative; now it is primary and basic.

Theology to-day, as I think, has two main tasks. They are one at the root, and those engaged on each should be concerned also for the other. But they are very different. First there is the thinking out afresh what are the standards of life to which a society must aim at conforming if it is to be in any sense a Christian society. We lack, and desperately need, an ethic of collective action. What is

the duty of a Christian managing-director or of a Christian trade union secretary in an industrial dispute? Neither may act in his own name alone. All the perspectives are different from those of individual relationships. But we offer no guidance whatever. And in the modern world half the decisions that men have to take are on behalf of some collective unit. This problem appears in its acutest form in the pacifist controversy.

In all this field, effective action is possible only if Christians (*a*) are ready to co-operate with non-Christians who share their aim, (*b*) are able to present what they believe on Christian grounds to be right as commendable also on general grounds of reason. Here is a field for the utmost co-operative effort in thought and action. The two great Papal Encyclicals *Rerum Novarum* and *Quadragesimo Anno*, and such writings as those of Maritain, set us an example from the Roman Catholic side. Those of us who, in comparison, are handicapped by inability to accept the Thomist scheme as an assured starting-point, though having nothing which is really so complete and thorough to put in its place, must do our best, even if for a time it makes poor showing beside the achievement of our colleagues. Perhaps one main task is to become clear precisely where and why we dissent from the Thomist basis, and see whether the whole structure may not be susceptible of modification in the light of our different or additional principles. But whether in that way or in some other, we must labour for the rebirth of Christendom.

Behind and beneath all this is the need to recover our apprehension of the Gospel alike in its essence and in its impact upon ourselves and the world. We have to face this tormented world, not as offering a means to its coherence in thought and its harmony in practice, but as challenging it in the name and power of Christ crucified and risen. We shall not try to " make sense " of everything; we shall openly proclaim that most things as they are have no sense in them at all. We shall not say that a Christian philosophy embraces all experience in a coherent and comprehensive scheme ; we shall declare that in the Gospel there is offered to men deliverance from a system of things —" the world "—which deserves the destruction which is coming upon it, a deliverance offered to all so that " the world " itself may receive it if it will. We proclaim, not general progress, but salvation to them that believe.

Here at once two problems confront us. First, what is the relation between that Order of Redemption which the Christian enters by faith and the Order of Creation to which he belongs as a man? Here is the pacifist problem again. Is there a Natural Order which is from God, as Catholic tradition holds? Or is there only Natural Disorder, the fruit of sin, from which Christ delivers us, as continental Protestantism has held? And if the latter view be adopted, does the deliverance take effect in this life or only in the life to come?

Secondly, what is that Gospel which we are to proclaim? Or, if we like to put it otherwise, what is the content of Revelation? Are there revealed truths, which can be formulated in propositions? Or is Revelation (as I am led to think) always given in Events? If that is so, there are truths about Revelation, but not actually revealed truths.

We must dig the foundations deeper than we did in pre-war years, or in the inter-war years when we developed our pre-war thoughts. And we must be content with less imposing structures. One day theology will take up again its larger and serener task and offer to a new Christendom its Christian map of life, its Christo-centric metaphysic. But that day can hardly dawn while any who are now already concerned with theology are still alive. The task that claims our labour now is far less alluring to one of my own temperament and upbringing, yet there can be no doubt that in theology as in life we shall be rather enriched than impoverished, even though we are concerned to light beacons in the darkness rather than to illuminate the world, if we are more completely dominated in thought and aspiration by the redeeming acts of God in Jesus Christ.

WILLIAM EBOR:

Our Pagan World

THE word "pagan" is occurring increasingly in comment on contemporary life. What does it mean?

One obvious observation might be made at the outset. The word "paganism" brings with it a rich echo out of the ancient world. We think of Olympus and of Delphi, of the gods of Greece and the heroic tales of ancient Rome. To transfer the word to our own day is almost an act of

discourtesy. For ancient paganism was profoundly religious. Godlessness was probably as rare a phenomenon as was atheism in the Middle Ages. In the ancient world everyone believed in God. "That is," as a recent writer remarks, "perhaps the most signal difference between ancient and modern history."[1]

We are familiar with the names of the ancient pagan deities merely as poetic fictions. We had to memorize their names as schoolboys in order to understand Milton's *Lycidas* or Pope's *Rape of the Lock*. It does not readily occur to us that men once actually believed in them. Yet they did. Virgil's *Aeneid* is a book of religious piety. Even the one great atheistic masterpiece of ancient literature, the *De Rerum Natura* of Lucretius, breathes the air of deep wrestlings with the supernatural. And while the philosopher rose above the cruder mythologies of the poets, he too recognized deity everywhere. Humility, awe before the holy, the *mysterium tremendum* of religious fear, dread of impiety and the sin of human pride—scarcely a masterpiece of ancient literature could be cited which does not display some or all of these. Even the worldling Horace cannot get away from them. And if one desires to see how the average educated man of the old world felt about such things, one has merely to dip into such an author as Plutarch. He was contemporary with the writing of the New Testament. Miracles, portents, oracular prophecies from the gods are scattered broadcast through his pages. By way of contrast the New Testament itself reads like a sober modern history.

Clearly, when we speak of paganism as characterizing our twentieth century we are describing something very different. The ancient world was cluttered up with the supernatural. Our world is, as it were, washed clean of the supernatural. We are living in the "twilight of the

[1] F. R. Barry, *Christianity and the New World* (Harpers, 1932, p. 9). The passage deserves a fuller quotation: "Nearly all the forces that play upon us conspire to make belief in God difficult. In the old world everyone believed in God: that is perhaps the most signal difference between ancient and modern history. The task of the earliest Christian preachers was to persuade men who believed in God to accept Christ's interpretation of Him. The task of the Church to-day is almost the opposite: to help people who at different levels and in various degrees believe in Christ to win to conviction about God. The revival, and even, it may be, the survival of Christianity today depends on its success in this enterprise."

gods." The simplest, basic presuppositions of the religious traditions of mankind have vanished from our world view. The classic books of the historic religions took them for granted—such things as awe and holy fear of deity, prayer, the sense of sin, the ritual need of sacrifice and expiation, the tension between Nature and something beyond Nature, the mystery of death, miracle—in a word, God. What writer, in all the oceans of religious literature of past ages, ever thought it necessary to describe an altar or to explain its meaning? The world was full of altars. Their meaning was obvious. They were taken seriously.

This contrast between paganism in its historic sense and the non-religious world view of our time is of great importance. Very little of the literature defending Christian belief in our time has as yet become conscious of it. Much of it still discusses the problems of religious faith against a background of accepted attitudes towards the supernatural which are no longer there. Nothing is more difficult than to explain what has long been obvious. Nothing is at times more necessary.

The twilight of the gods! What does it mean in terms of daily living? What is life like without "fear" of God, without prayer, without sin? How can we describe a modern pagan?

It would seem that the modern pagan should not be difficult to describe. Modern literature, from Ibsen to Aldous Huxley, has dealt with him in volume upon volume of disillusioned rhetoric. Literature lives close to life and describes what it sees. Hence it is likely to be a better guide in exploring the chaos and deep night of modern disillusionment than are our abstract metaphysicians.

Let us, at any rate, start out on a voyage of exploration of modern paganism under the guidance of a modern poet and novelist—Thomas Hardy. He is being read by almost every schoolboy in the English-speaking world. It is through his eyes perhaps more than through those of any other writer that "noble atheism" is becoming a familiar view of the world in the thinking of our young. I quote, to be sure, not from his novels, but from his poem *A Plaint to Man.* God—the God of mythological religion—is speaking:

> When you slowly emerged from the den of Time,
> And gained percipience as you grew,
> And fleshed you fair out of shapeless slime,
> Wherefore, O Man, did there come to you

The unhappy need of creating me—
A form like your own—for praying to?
Somewhere above the gloomy aisles
Of this wailful world?

The truth should be told, and the fact be faced
That had best been faced in earlier years:
The fact of life with dependence placed
On the human heart's resource alone.

The disillusionments of centuries of modern thought find expression in these lines. I have called Thomas Hardy's atheism "noble." The adjective is, I think, fully deserved. It would be idle folly to underrate the appeal which a banishment of God such as this can make to the ordinary men and women of our time. For there is here no sneering at the traditional beliefs of mankind. God was needed by earlier generations—a gentle anodyne for the brute facts of life. Thomas Hardy in his later years could write a beautiful appreciation of the English village church, with its cultured liturgy and its gentle echoes out of the believing past. The need was indeed "unhappy," and truth might well have been "faced in earlier years." But the brute facts are not explained away. They are with us still. Thomas Hardy's own novels are a long comment on the "gloomy aisles of a wailful world." I should, indeed, be the last one to take his classics of English prose out of a modern schoolboy's curriculum. For if our pagan age thinks it must abolish its gods, let this be done with open eyes and a vision of what it really means.

Yet if there be no sneering at traditional religion, there is no compromise with it either. It belongs to the age of "opiates." Truth demands its banishment. Truth and Fact become substitutes for Faith and are themselves clothed in mystic grandeur. Man surrenders his hopes of supernatural help. But he is at the same time unloosed from the shackles of supernatural awe and fear. He becomes his own deity. He stands alone to outface the enigma of Fate. Disillusionment has brought not merely twilight of the gods, but also the Dawn of Man,

with dependence placed
On the human heart's resource alone.

Is there an educated person to-day who has not at one time or another experienced the temptation of this

emancipated disillusionment? It would be unrealistic to deny its thrill. And the more the inherited faith still lives in memory, the more does emancipation bring a sense of freedom. Many a modern man has, indeed, become "like unto the gods." Nor need he be, even at the first, blind to the burdens which this freedom will bring in its train—loneliness in an alien universe, the weariness of pride, the haunting memories of former trust in now cast-off hopes and dreams. All such burdens seem small in comparison with liberty. Cardinal Newman,[1] in words of moving eloquence, has given at least one description of this thrill of abandon to a godless world, when a man's soul "awakes as from a dream, and begins to realize that there in now no such thing as a moral law or the transgression of law, that sin is a phantom and punishment a bugbear, that it is free to sin, free to enjoy the world and the flesh, that eating the fruit of the tree of knowledge makes him one of the gods, so that he can look back upon his former state of faith and innocence with a sort of contempt and indignation, as if he were then but a fool and the dupe of imposture."

But thrills, alas, do not live long. They do not solve the hard practical problems of daily living. Furthermore, while a Thomas Hardy or other intellectual can take solace in his art or his rhetoric of disillusionment, the average citizen has no such recourse. He is not even likely to formulate his disbelief. Heroic defiance is not for him. He drifts with the tide of momentary desire and need. The pride of atheism is beyond him. His refuge is atheism's milder counterpart—worldliness.

Many a man or woman of our modern world has, indeed, made the discovery that to get along without God is at first easy enough. Sunrise and sunset follow each other as regularly as if the gods were still on their thrones. Men ply their useful or useless business much as in the ages of faith. Nor does the tenor of moral life outwardly change overnight. Particularly is this true of those who still come out of a religious tradition, who have been brought up in a home at least half-godly, who obey moral laws and taboos out of youthful habit. Conscience can apparently go quietly to sleep with no thunderbolts rending the sky. As with a free-wheeling automobile running downhill, never has travel on life's highway been more easy. To live on one's capital has always been a pleasant mode of life—in morals as in

[1] Newman, *Idea of a University*, Discourse VI.

economics. Supernatural sanctions for the Ten Commandments may have vanished, but are they really needed? Is there not custom and the ethical code of enlightened selfishness? At worst are there not the police and the ever-increasing restraint of collective law? Philosophies of this-worldliness beckon on this side or that—philosophies which stop short of descent to the gutter, yet remain comfortable and easy. Epicureanism has its own traditions as old as those of religion, its own restraints, its own wisdom, even its saints. Our grandfathers lived by the epistles of St Paul. We can turn to Lin-Yu-Tang and Epicurean versions of Confucius. If we need a bulwark against the more violent forms of evil, is not this gentle Epicureanism enough? We, too, play safe. As H. L. Mencken once put it, in commenting on the sex problem: "The strict monogamist never gets into trouble."

And if Epicureanism does not happen to suit our fancy, if Fate bludgeons us into a more tragic view of life, we can turn to Stoic defiance—not the Stoicism of Marcus Aurelius, with its cosmic piety, but a new Stoicism, burdened with a more godless universe, but also correspondingly more heroic. It is the creed of a Thomas Hardy, of Henley's *Invictus*, of Ibsen, of the "hard" tradition of modern literature. Its priests are the aesthetic intelligentsia of the past fifty years. Life, in its view, is indeed a grim business—man a sport of meaningless Fate. But man endures, and man defies. Many a college freshman has thrilled to the paean of human pride pictured in Bertrand Russell's masterpiece of modern prose, *A Free Man's Worship*:[1]

> Brief and powerless is Man's life; on him and all his race the slow, sure doom falls pitiless and dark. Blind to good and evil, reckless of destruction, omnipotent matter rolls on its relentless way; for Man, condemned to-day to lose his dearest, to-morrow himself to pass through the gate of darkness, it remains only to cherish, ere yet the blow falls, the lofty thoughts that ennoble his little day; disdaining the coward terrors of the slave of Fate, to worship at the shrine that his own hands have built; undismayed by the empire of chance, to preserve a mind free from the wanton tyranny that rules his outward life; fondly defiant of the irresistible forces that tolerate, for a moment, his knowledge and his condemnation, to sustain alone, a weary but unyielding Atlas, the world that his own ideals have fashioned despite the trampling march of unconscious power.

[1] *Mysticism and Logic* (Longmans, 1918), p. 56.

These are, of course, but glimpses into the pagan thinking of our time. Secularism is a hydra-headed monster and takes on a myriad forms. All sorts of sport can be played with a godless world, up to and including the invention of new gods, new hopes, new faiths. Man cannot endure sight of an abyss for long. He escapes, if only into dreams. Worldliness, in its first flush of unshackled human pride, is perhaps not conscious of the need of substitute gospels. It seems lusty and strong and rejoices to run its course. Our world to-day is full of pagans. But they are young pagans, still amateurs at living " without hope and without God in the world." They are still free-wheeling, with long centuries of Christian restraints still ruling in their subconscious minds. Camping in a desert is still a luxury business when you are equipped with civilization's stores. It is mere romantic play-acting. It may be pleasant enough while it lasts. But it won't last. The jaunty pagan of our capitalistic society must feel even now the doom of his Epicurean or Stoic defiance. How rapidly his complaisance and play-acting can vanish into history ! Is worldliness in these easy forms an alternative any longer in countries like Russia or Germany ? To confront a godless universe may seem to be a thrilling experience—perhaps because the universe isn't really godless. To confront a godless Commissar may be a very different thing—perhaps because he really is godless.

Even in those societies of our modern world where pagans can still sit at ease, rumblings of disquiet have long been heard. Abolish the supernatural out of life. You have become " profane "—resembling a house swept clean. But the house does not remain empty long. Demons take possession. How many a modern, starting out on his voyage in a godless world with a song of freedom in his heart, has awakened to find himself a slave to powers he did not dream existed ! Epicurean restraints have given way to Epicurean lusts. " These violent delights have violent ends." And since the traditional ethical standards of mankind are not yet exorcized, this slavery to pleasure sets up an unendurable conflict. Disillusionment devours disillusionment. Millions of emancipated moderns could describe their " morning after " moods in Shakespeare's terrible lines:

> The expense of spirit in a waste of shame
> Is lust in action; and till action, lust

> Is perjur'd, murd'rous, bloody, full of blame,
> Savage, extreme, rude, cruel, not to trust,
> Enjoy'd no sooner but despised straight,
> Past reason hunted, and no sooner had
> Past reason hated, as a swallowed bait
> On purpose laid to make the taker mad.

Indeed, it is rather a striking fact that, in so far as worldliness embodies itself in love of pleasure, the great religions of the world have confronted it with more of pity than of hate. Its cure lies partly within itself. Few men in the gutter really sneer at the gods. They fear and they tremble. The great symbols of godlessness in the world's literature have none of them been Epicurean sinners—the Pharisees of the New Testament, Shakespeare's Iago, Milton's Satan. For the lover of pleasure still believes in a search for something outside himself. Pride may have started him on his search, but in the bitter cup of disillusionment pride gives place to remorse, the gateway to penitence. The wine shop and the brothel are still paradoxical, pitiable symbols of belief in God. As G. K. Chesterton once put it: " Purity and simplicity are essential to the passions—yes, even to evil passions. Even vice demands a sort of virginity."

I do not intend, of course, to belittle the dangers of Epicurean worldliness. It beckons to our young on every Broadway of the modern world. The " blind life " to which it leads has been the theme for warnings by the moralist and the preacher from the dawn of time. It is assuming giant forms in our age as perhaps never before in the history of the world. Yet in itself it is an ancient enemy of human culture, as well as of religion. With all its dangers, it is a running away from the enthroned gods, not yet an open denial.

To meet godlessness in its ultimate forms you must turn not to the Epicureans of our age, but to its cynics. Here we meet at last the " darkness visible " of a world in which the gods are really dead, the horror world of " wailing and gnashing of teeth." The philosophers and metaphysicians of the schools will not describe it for you. How can there be a philosophy of chaos and dark night? But men and women by the thousands are living in it. You can meet them by the score in the novels and plays of the twentieth century. Some of the most revered masterpieces of contemporary literature describe this city of the dead in detail, as Dante describes the infernal city of Dis—its fiery

walls, " its grave citizens, its great company." Open the pages of James Joyce's *Ulysses*, or the pages of Marcel Proust, or of Aldous Huxley's *Point Counter Point*, and you may walk within its horrific walls.

For here you are in a world of utter meaningless void. Virtue is meaningless, of course, but so is vice. Cynical disdain sits at the heart even of those who writhe as slaves of lust. There may be nothing left except a plunge into the whirlwind of lust, but the cynic has lost all romantic illusions about it. Don Juan becomes as absurd as St Francis of Assisi. Hence the cynic may decide to spare himself such meaningless explorations. He may even turn ascetic.

Pagan asceticism is perhaps the final paradox of a godless world. It is the *reductio ad absurdum* of worldliness. Absurd as it may seem, it is not rare in our time. It lurks in the background of every view of life which denies the supernatural. One can venture to prophesy that it will eventually overtake even the rival religions of our time, such as those of Germany or Russia, which think they have escaped the dilemma of godlessness by way of worship of corporate humanity. Those of our modern pagans who have not yet been caught up in these new idolatries have at least the advantage of seeing the dilemma of worldliness more clearly.

For the dilemma is there, if we can but see it. The number of modern pagans who are willing to acknowledge it increases as world-weariness succeeds the flush of romantic illusion. Listen, for example, to an honest observer of our contemporary moral scene. He happens to be discussing modern life as it reveals itself in modern literature. Specifically, he is contrasting the tragedies of a dramatist like Ibsen with the tragedies written in former, still religious, centuries: Man, as the Christian sees him,[1] " lives in a world which he may not dominate, but which is always aware of him. Occupying the exact centre of a universe which would have no meaning except for him and being so little below the angels that, if he believes in God, he has no hesitation in imagining Him formed as he is formed and crowned with a crown like that which he or one of his fellows wears. He assumes that each of his acts reverberates through the universe. His passions are important to him because he believes them important throughout all time and all space;

[1] Joseph Wood Krutch, *The Modern Temper* (Harcourt, 1933), p. 134.

the very fact that he can sin (no modern can) means that this universe is watching his acts; and though he may perish, a God leans out from infinity to strike him down. And it is exactly because an Ibsen cannot think of man in any such terms as these that his persons have so shrunk and that his ' tragedy ' has lost that power which real tragedy always has for making that infinitely ambitious creature called man content to accept his misery if only he can be made to feel great enough and important enough. An Oswald is not a Hamlet chiefly because he has lost that tie with the natural and supernatural world which the latter had. No ghost will leave the other world to warn or encourage him, there is no virtue and no vice which he can possibly have which can be really important, and when he dies neither his death nor the manner of it will be, outside the circle of two or three people as unnecessary as himself, any more important than that of a rat behind the arras."

" No modern can sin." Precisely ! Could we find a clearer, simpler culmination of the " Pagan's Progress "? Goodness without meaning; despair without meaning. Hence many a modern, logical enough to see the end of his striving, turns into a pagan monk—the monastic cell alternating perhaps with the wine-shop. Recent generations have seen this ultimate end of paganism exhibited in many lives.[1]

The " Pagan's Progress "—from exhilarating scepticism to meaningless despair. Observe our Occidental world, our Broadways, our village Main Streets, and you will see our young being enticed to set out on this pilgrimage. Of course this paganism will devour itself. Man cannot live by meaningless goodness or by meaningless despair. The great new religions of the modern world—Juggernauts of Power—find in this cynicism the soil in which they grow. They may find their doom in the cynicism to which they too will lead after they have exhausted their own store of illusion. It is a soil in which Christianity can grow also.

[1] One of the most striking examples of the paradox of cynical asceticism known to me is a remark of Flaubert, the French novelist, author of *Madame Bovary*. He and George Sand had discussed in several exchanges of letters the problem of emancipated sex morality. " If you want my confession," so Flaubert concludes, " I shall make it freely to you. The sense of the grotesque has restrained me from an inclination towards a disorderly life. I maintain that cynicism borders on chastity." See McKenzie, *The George Sand-Gustave Flaubert Correspondence* (Boni and Liveright, 1921), p. 13.

But it must be an honest Christianity, not a mere manicuring of worldly morals, not a mere secular piety. It, too, must have faced, as Thomas Hardy's atheism has faced, the problem of Truth and of Fact, and of God.

Indeed, if a word of prophecy could be ventured, it would be that the paganism discussed in this essay will shortly be out of date. Millions are still living by it in what is left of secularized Christendom, but they are already behind the times. A great gulf is beginning to divide the twentieth century from the nineteenth. Among the thinking of mankind, the age of sentimental atheism is probably over. Judgment has overtaken it. It ends in nihilistic cynicism or in new religions. The wheel has come full circle. The paganism of Germany or Russia is no longer the paganism of Paris or London or New York. It has rediscovered the gods—if only in the form of idols or of demons.

The new day will mean for Christianity a momentous change. Christianity has been engaged for centuries in a struggle against its own secularization, against a worldliness purged of demons by its own gift of the Holy Ghost. To have achieved, though only for a little space, a safe pagan secularism, one in which modern man could nurse the illusion of trust in himself, is one of Christianity's paradoxical triumphs. Modern man has been a " younger son " going into far countries with a rich treasure out of his divided living. The marvel was that he had so great an inheritance to waste. But now the time of want is at hand. Modern man will have to turn again home or go into bondage under alien gods.

For the pagan gods are rushing back again, to occupy their ancient thrones. Christianity can once more fight its battles in the open, against foes unveiled and worthy of its steel— " against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places."

" Behold the days come, saith the Lord God, that I will send a famine into the land, not a famine of bread, nor a thirst for water, but of hearing the words of the Lord:

" And they shall wander from sea to sea, and from the north even to the east, they shall run to and fro to seek the word of the Lord, and shall not find it."

Theodore O. Wedel.

The Doctrine Report and the Sacraments

THE Report of the Doctrinal Commission has been somewhat severely criticized in some quarters for having devoted so much space to the doctrine of the Sacraments. The general public, even the Christian public, it is said, is not interested in theological theories about the Sacraments, and the Commission showed a false sense of proportion in dealing with them at such length. If the Commission had been appointed to address the general public directly and to give some answer to the questions specially prominent in its mind, there would no doubt have been considerable force in this criticism. But in fact the Commission was appointed by the Archbishops to consider the nature and grounds of Christian doctrine with a view to demonstrating the extent of existing agreement within the Church of England and with a view to investigating how far it is possible to remove or diminish existing differences. Now no one who has any knowledge of the existing differences and party divisions within the Church of England can deny that, however deplorable the fact may be, those differences and divisions are to a great extent historically rooted in questions of sacramental and more especially of Eucharistic doctrine. And if the Commission has succeeded in showing, as undoubtedly it hoped and intended to show, by a careful examination of sacramental doctrine, that the differences on this subject within the Church of England are really much less fundamental and much more readily reconcilable than most keen church-people suppose, then the rather lengthy discussion of the Sacraments and especially of the Eucharist must surely be allowed to be very well worth while. The man in the street and even perhaps some men in the pew may not be very much interested by the discussion itself. But if the discussion leads to greater understanding, sympathy, and a recognition of fundamental agreement between those who *are* interested in sacramental doctrine and have hitherto imagined themselves to be radically opposed to one another, then certainly the effect of their more united witness to sacramental truth will make itself felt even among those who have never really understood or wished to understand what all the historical controversies have been about.

Now to deal in a single article with all or even with most

of the aspects of a subject which covers so many pages of closely reasoned argument in the Report is not only a difficult but really a quite impossible task. I certainly do not propose to attempt it. I propose to confine what I have to say almost entirely to the Eucharist, which has become so paradoxically and so disastrously a centre of controversy and division among Christian people. And I want to go beyond the text of the Report in order to give an example of the kind of restatement of Eucharistic doctrine to which the Report may show the way. The restatement will be based frankly on principles which may be called in the broad sense Catholic or, if you will, Anglo-Catholic. But I want to restate Catholic doctrines in such a way as to show, if I can, that they need not conflict with any of the great principles for which theologians of the Evangelical tradition are bound to contend. The Report indeed itself contains two memoranda on the Eucharist, one written from a more Anglo-Catholic and one from a more Evangelical point of view, and the attentive reader will, I think, be impressed by the agreement which they manifest upon the doctrine of Christ's presence in the Eucharist. It is on that kind of foundation which we must try to build.

Let me then begin my attempt at restatement by considering the relation of the Eucharist to Baptism. The relation is, I think, best understood in the light of St John's symbolism of Water and Blood. Water symbolizes the divine life which in Jesus comes down from heaven, the new gift of God's grace. Blood symbolizes the human life of Jesus sacrificed to God upon earth. Baptism therefore signifies primarily the new life given to the Christian when he is once for all at the outset born again as God's true child. The Eucharist signifies the bestowal of Jesus's own sacrificed manhood which has passed through suffering and death, and is now given to be the constant food and strength of the Christian all through his earthly pilgrimage. Thus Baptism is in a special sense the sacrament of God's work in redemption in so far as it acts upon humanity from without. It directs our minds to the divine initiative both in the free forgiveness of sin and in the gift of a new life by which men become really children of God. In that truth of the divine initiative lies the fundamental justification for the Baptism of infants, whatever its difficulties. The Eucharist, on the other hand, is specially the sacrament of God's redemption in so far as it acts upon humanity from within

—*i.e.*, through the perfect manhood of Jesus offered to God on behalf of all. Baptism with water and the Holy Spirit is the sacrament of the divine life coming down from heaven; the Eucharist is the sacrament of the human life sacrificed to God upon earth.

That sacrifice has been accomplished once for all. Calvary is historical fact. And, therefore, in one of its essential aspects the Eucharist is a memorial of certain actual events, viz., the Last Supper and the Crucifixion. Nevertheless, the Eucharist, in being a memorial, is essentially more than a memorial. For the events which it commemorates culminate in the resurrection and ascension of Christ, and thereby become more than just historical events which took place at a particular date in the past. They are not just members of a class of historical events on a level with all the rest. For in the human life of Christ glorified through the Cross there is expressed the meaning and purpose of all history. The purpose of man's creation is realized and achieved in the free self-offering of man to God through death. Therein both the atonement for sin and the victory of love consist. In a sinful world the self-offering could only be made because of the infinite grace of the Son of God in taking manhood upon Himself. Yet even His self-offering would have been ineffective and therefore incomplete in its triumph, were it not that in the power of His risen life Christ comes again to incorporate us into His self-offering and to be the head of the new humanity in His Church. The Church itself is both redeemed and redeeming through the self-offering in which it is made one with the living Christ. And it is of our whole union with Christ in His self-offering that the Eucharist is the sacrament, the efficacious symbol.

From this general statement of the meaning of the Eucharist two conclusions follow:

(*a*) That which the Eucharist symbolizes is an objective mystery, the supernatural fact of Christ's triumph over death and sin, of His exaltation of manhood into heaven by His sacrifice of Himself. The reality of that fact is not dependent on the power of particular Christians to apprehend it subjectively as a fact within their consciousness. Because the highest reality is love, it is a law of God's universe that earthly life is to be redeemed and made heavenly by the completeness of self-offering made through death. In the resurrection and ascension of Christ it has already been so

redeemed. And the same Christ who died and rose and ascended, lives and comes down again to impart to us that divine and human love in which He sacrificed Himself and triumphed. Those are the facts, not dependent on our faith, which the Eucharist sets forth and declares to us.

(*b*) It is as members of Christ, of His Body, of the corporate humanity which He has redeemed and is redeeming, that we through the Eucharist partake of the new life which Christ gives. The whole action of the Eucharist is a corporate action. There the whole body of Christians, priest and people together, representing Christ's Church, makes its act of offering to God, and Christ who Himself inspires the act meets it with the gift of His own offered life in the sacramental signs, so that His people may make their offering in all their daily lives more perfect and complete. The individual Christian as he communicates may realize very imperfectly what he is doing or what Christ is doing for him. "What Christ does he knows not now, but he will know hereafter." But as he takes part with what light of faith and spiritual understanding he has, he is by his action taken up into the action of Christ's whole Church and receives thereby infinitely more than at the moment he is aware of. The partaking of the least spiritually advanced member of the congregation is really as essential to the meaning of the rite as the part of the priest himself. For, though the Eucharist sets forth an accomplished fact of redemption, it becomes effective as a means of grace to all and each only as each and all take their appointed parts in its action.

Now we turn to history to consider what was defective in the doctrine and practice of the Mass as they existed in the Western Church in the Middle Ages. Three points are to be noticed:

(1) The part of the congregation in the service had ceased to be essential. Communion was rare, the laity for the most part communicating once a year. The essential action belonged to the priest alone. When the people attended Mass they were concerned, very often, to see only the Host elevated at the Consecration. The words of the service were unintelligible.

(2) The thought of the glorified Christ operating through His Body the Church in the whole action of the liturgy had almost disappeared. Devotion was centred on Jesus Christ as the human victim offered for man's sin on Calvary

and also offered in the Mass. There was little attempt to look beyond Calvary to the Christ in glory. Medieval crucifixes depict as realistically as possible the suffering figure of a man. The older type of crucifix which presents the figure on the cross robed and crowned was no longer made.

(3) In the Mass, therefore, attention was altogether focused on the consecration as the priest's act by which the bread and wine are changed into the Body and Blood of Christ as offered in death. According to medieval doctrine it was the offering of Christ's human body and blood on the Cross which constituted the Atonement, and since the Mass was the continuation, if not the repetition, of the atoning sacrifice, the one essential thing about it was that there also the very Body and Blood of Christ should be offered to God as in death. It is significant that whereas St Augustine speaks of the communion of the people as the completion of the sacrament, Aquinas lays it down that the sacrament of the Eucharist is completed in the consecration. It was to preserve this doctrine of the consecration while purging it of material grossness that the theory of transubstantiation was elaborated.

In dealing with the Mass the Reformers devoted their attention exclusively to the first and third of the defects we have noticed. On the whole they ignored the second. They were zealous to restore to the Christian people their proper share in the Eucharist. The Mass must become a communion. And they desired to repudiate the idea that the one essential thing in the sacrament was a change wrought in the elements by the priest's recitation of a formula over them. But on the whole they did not attempt sufficiently to restore the doctrine of the Glorified Christ acting in the Eucharist through His Body the Church, to unite with Himself in His living sacrifice each and all of its members as they commemorate His death. Thus it came about that the Reformers, while they sought to do a supremely right and positive thing, went about it, on the whole, in a too negative way. Instead of correcting the defects in the medieval Mass by supplying the elements which it lacked and so restoring the balance of truth, they sought rather to take away from it what had become the occasion of superstition and abuse. Instead of bringing men back to think of the living Christ acting from heaven through sacramental signs to unite His members with Him-

self, they sought rather to prevent the adoration of Christ in the consecrated elements. And with the same idea of removing the occasion of superstition, all the outward pomp and beauty and adornments of the service were ruthlessly swept away. Subsequent controversies about the Eucharist have been largely barren and unedifying because they have been confined to the affirmation or denial of the single point which the medieval theology of the Mass had made central —viz., the change of the elements by consecration so as to become the same Body and Blood which were offered on the Cross. This kind of question really admits of no answer in the terms in which it is posed. The great service rendered by the Doctrine Commission's Report is to enable us to consider the old controversies from a fresh point of view which takes into account both our profounder knowledge of biblical theology and modern metaphysical ideas concerning the relations of matter and spirit. Our profounder knowledge of biblical theology affects especially the doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice, while modern metaphysical ideas affect especially the doctrine of the Eucharistic Presence. I will consider each point in turn.

When we examine what is said in the New Testament about the meaning of Christ's death, we find that two kinds of language are used about it. It is spoken of as a bearing of sin or penalty for sin, the suggestion being that Christ suffered for sin on man's behalf. From this point of view the death is represented as vicariously penal. On the other hand the death is spoken of as a sacrifice for sin. This thought is implied not only when the word "propitiation," which ought really to be "expiation," is used, but also by all language about the Blood of Jesus cleansing us from sin or as inaugurating the new covenant. So long as it is assumed that a victim slain in sacrifice bears the sin of the offerer, there is little difficulty in reconciling these two kinds of language with one another. The assumption was a natural one for theologians to make, when the meaning of sacrifice under the Old Covenant had largely been forgotten. And thus it came about that in the Middle Ages there was no contrast between the thought of Christ's death as sacrificial and the thought of it as a vicarious penalty or as a satisfaction for sin. In any case the atonement made was thought of as complete in the death of Christ.

But the work of modern biblical scholars has brought to light a paradox to which theologians had long been

blind. In the later law of the Jewish Church and State—and Judaism never made any clear distinction between the two—death had in fact two quite opposite kinds of significance. In the first place it was a punishment for criminals, or a penalty for sin inflicted by divine justice. In the second place it was sacrificial—that is, the death of something offered to God. In the later law sacrificial death was certainly connected with sin; but the animal victim was not thought of as in any way bearing or carrying the sin of the offerer. On the contrary, God would only accept a spotless victim, and just for that reason the scapegoat, the animal which *was* believed to have the sin of the people transferred to it, could not be sacrificed, but was driven away into the wilderness. Again, the purpose of the sacrifice was not completed by the death of the victim. The animal was slain in sacrifice in order that the blood, representing the stainless life offered to God, might then be used for purposes of cleansing and expiation. At every point, then, there is a complete contrast between sacrificial and penal death, the holy death and the unholy.

There is, therefore, a profound paradox in the fact that the New Testament speaks of our Lord *both* as the bearer of sin in His death, *and* as the sacrifice whose blood inaugurates the new covenant and cleanses us from sin. What is the explanation of it? I believe Christian faith has a right to be bold at this point. The explanation is simple but profound. Christ's perfect and stainless love which voluntarily accepted death as a penalty for sin, which was content to bear the sin of many, to be numbered with the transgressors and to make its grave with the wicked, by that very act converted the outwardly penal death into its very opposite, the death of the perfect sacrifice most perfectly acceptable to God. The death which Jesus accepted as vicariously penal, God accepted as sacrificial, because it was the death of perfect love. The most unholy death is converted into the most holy.

After all, the religious man who does not try, as many of the noblest philosophers have tried, to make out that death is in some way unreal or only an appearance, is obliged, I think, to account for it in one of two ways. Either he must think of it as in some way a universal penalty for universal human sin or unholiness; or else he can only think of it as in some way sacrificial—the offering of a life to God who gave it. The first thought has been an accepted

commonplace both of Jewish and of Christian theology. But the writer of Ecclesiastes has pointed out once for all the unsatisfactoriness of this attempt by itself to reconcile death with the moral order of the universe. "All things come alike to all: there is one event to the righteous and to the wicked; to the good and to the clean and to the unclean; to him that sacrificeth and to him that sacrificeth not: as is the good, so is the sinner; and he that sweareth, as he that feareth an oath. This is an evil in all that is done under the sun, that there is one event unto all." Truly in this world there is no abolition of the universal death-penalty; in that sense all alike must be numbered with the transgressors. But is this law really an evil in all that is done under the sun? Christ has shown it to be the opportunity for a universal atonement. For the perfect love which voluntarily accepts and undergoes the penalty of shameful death transforms that death into the death of sacrifice holy acceptable to God, the gateway to the life of heavenly glory that has overcome the world and sin. And the same love in which Christ suffered and triumphed is now shed abroad in the hearts of those who believe on Him, and enables them to follow their Lord in transforming pain and death into the means of victorious and atoning sacrifice.

Such is the sacrifice of which the Eucharist is the sacrament. And, looking at it in this way, we can see at once how limited and one-sided and short-sighted is the doctrine of it which, as it were, stops short at the Cross and demands only some kind of quasi-material and physical identity between the consecrated elements and the Body which was crucified. I do not think that the first Christians, being Jews, could ever have believed that Christ's death was truly sacrificial at all, if they had believed that His body had seen corruption in the tomb. For to the Jewish mind it was quite unthinkable that any body offered and accepted as a sacrifice could be allowed to decay and be corrupted. Sacrifice was the *offering*, not simply the destruction, of a life. And, therefore, the memorial of Calvary as the perfect sacrifice must carry our minds on to the thought of Christ's sacrificed life, not destroyed, but glorified in heaven and returning in power to enable Christ's followers to offer and sacrifice themselves in Him. From this point of view it seems to me entirely right and natural that we should speak of the Eucharist as a spiritual sacrifice. For it is the sacramental representation and re-presentation of

the sacrifice of Himself once offered by Christ on behalf of us all, in order that Christ's sacrifice may renew itself in and through us who are the members of His spiritual Body. I cannot see that there is anything in such a belief which conflicts with any principle either of Catholic or of Evangelical theology.

Finally, I would say a few words about the doctrine of Christ's Presence in the Eucharist. The Doctrine Report emphasizes the important truth which should indeed be obvious that no devout Christian who values Holy Communion would question the real spiritual and objective presence of Christ Himself at the service which He appointed. Questions and differences of doctrine concern the connexion of the Presence with the consecrated elements of bread and wine, the traditional doctrine of the Real Presence affirming the reality of that connexion. Here an important fact must be remembered which has altered the issues of the old controversies. One of the rubrics of our Prayer Book of 1662 tells us that "no adoration ought to be done unto the Sacramental Bread and Wine bodily received or unto any corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood. For the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored, and the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural Body to be at one time in more places than one." To-day I do not think that any instructed Anglican theologian—I cannot speak about theologians of other Churches—would contend that Christ's natural flesh and blood, having risen from the tomb, now occupy space in a local heaven above earth. That being so, one of the main ancient objections to the doctrine of the Real Presence is removed, and with it the fear that to speak of the consecrated elements as actually being the Body and Blood of Christ implies any sort of abhorrent or materialistic notions.

So much being granted, it seems to some of us that the old doctrine of the Real Presence has stood for something of permanent truth and value. We are not afraid of associating with a material object the presence and action of Him who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven to redeem earthly life. But we refuse to ask or answer over-curious and impossible questions as to the precise difference between physical objects as they are the

moment before consecration and the moment afterwards. We do not affirm that the bread and wine are in themselves at all changed by consecration either through receiving a new substance or through acquiring new properties which can rightly be called theirs. Yet we believe that in the Eucharist the bread and wine are themselves taken up into a new spiritual relation with the living Christ. Consecration sets them apart to be the very organ of Christ's gracious self-revelation and action towards His faithful people, and they actually become that organ in so far as, through them and what is done with them, the life of Christ once offered through the breaking of His Body and the shedding of His Blood is now actually given to be the spiritual food of Christians. The bread and wine become the Body and Blood simply through Christ's use of them to be the very means by which in His Church He continually sets forth the sacrifice of His death and makes us partakers of His self-sacrificed and risen life. To this use the elements are dedicated by consecration, and in it they have that real and spiritual relation to Christ Himself which belongs to the proper meaning of the terms His Body and His Blood. We should not wish to say that the Body and Blood are in or under the species of the elements, but rather that the elements themselves become the Body and Blood in Christ's spiritual use of them as a sacrament.

Just as when we reflect on the Incarnation there is no answer to the question "How can a man be God?" so long as we confine ourselves to that bare question and do not go on to consider the whole evidence of Christian faith and experience as to what God in Jesus has done with man, so when we reflect on the Eucharist there is no answer to the question "How can this bread be the Body of Christ?" until we go on to consider all the evidence of Christian faith and experience as to what Christ can do and signify with bread. When we do so consider, there may be a deeply Christian truth in the belief that the redeeming action of Christ from heaven descends through His Body the Church into the very bread and wine consecrated as the symbols of His sacrificed life, so that by partaking of that life in the lowliest of signs we may be lifted towards its highest glory.

O. C. Quick.

The Hymns of Charles Wesley included in *Hymns Ancient and Modern*

Among those who helped to maintain and revive the Christian faith in eighteenth-century England not the least interesting is Charles Wesley. It is the purpose of this essay to discuss some of the thirty-two hymns of this well-known hymn writer which are incorporated in *Hymns Ancient and Modern*, rather than to estimate the life and labours of Charles, the brother of John. At the same time the hymns will be appreciated more fully if a few words of introduction are added concerning the author. He has naturally been somewhat overshadowed by his more famous brother; but, apart from his gift for poetry, Charles Wesley was a very real leader of the Methodist revival and played a larger part in the spread of evangelical religion than is usually realized. His character and achievements are worthy of a more intense study than is sometimes assigned to them. The monument in Westminster Abbey, unveiled by Dean Stanley in 1876, consists rightly of portraits of the two brothers, not of John Wesley only. Indeed, the two evangelists have been termed by one authoritative writer " the Romulus and Remus who jointly laid the foundations of Methodist Rome."

Like John, Charles lived to an advanced age, to over eighty years. He was born (prematurely) on December 18, 1707, at Epworth, and was the eighteenth child of his parents; he died on March 29, 1788, in Marylebone. Like John, he went for a short while to America with Governor Oglethorpe, and, like John, he kept an interesting journal. This valuable manuscript was providentially rescued when found in a mutilated condition among the loose straw on the floor of a furniture warehouse where his son had deposited some of his goods. Like his brother, also, he was a pioneer evangelist. From 1739 till 1756 he preached on unceasing itinerant journeys throughout England and Ireland.

In a volume by Dr Wiseman, consisting of the lectures on Charles Wesley delivered in America in 1931, there is published a remarkable map of the Post Roads in England and Wales as they were in 1765, based on a map drawn by the geographer of King George III. This marks all the towns and villages visited by Charles Wesley. These places cover the entire British Isles from Berwick to Land's End.

Like his brother, again, he was a scholar. He was captain of Westminster School in 1725, before he left it with a scholarship that took him to Christ Church. It was no mean honour to have held this position at Westminster in the third decade of the eighteenth century, as a list of the four previous captains reveals. Unlike his brother, he made the happiest of marriages and became the father and grandfather of eminent musicians. It is worth noting that Charles, not John, was the original founder of the Holy Club.

Charles Wesley is most famous, however, as the author of hymns which are still sung by all types of Christian congregations all over the English-speaking world. Numerically he stands fourth in the index of authors and translators in *Hymns Ancient and Modern*, the three higher being J. M. Neale, Henry Baker, and J. Ellerton.

Those who selected the thirty-two hymns had a task which called for judgment, since Charles wrote between five and six thousand hymns and religious verses and paraphrases. These were edited in their entirety in a monumental collection of thirteen volumes in 1868 by Dr Osborne, which still remains the standard authority for the originals of Charles Wesley's verses. Those who have the inclination to explore these pages of thousands of verses will be rewarded by the discovery of many gems, although naturally a large proportion of them belong to a past age and are no longer remembered and are not of a high level.

The thirty-two hymns printed in *A. and M.* may be classified conveniently under four main headings: (1) General, (2) Holy Communion, (3) Hymns for Festivals, and (4) Evangelistic and Devotional.

1. *General.*—It is not making an overstatement to say that the nine hymns—"Christ, whose glory fills the skies"; "Jesu, Lover of my soul"; "O Love Divine, how sweet Thou art!"; "Rejoice, the Lord is King"; "Let saints on earth in concert sing"; "Soldiers of Christ, arise"; "Love Divine, all love excelling"; "O for a thousand tongues to sing"; and "Ye servants of God, your Master proclaim"—still hold the highest of places wherever hymns are sung throughout the hymn-singing Churches. Indeed, entire volumes of authenticated anecdotes could be compiled concerning the permanent influence that these hymns have exercised on the souls of Christian men and women. Moreover, they make their appeal to men of letters and scholars, as well as to the multitudes who make up the congregations.

Bishop Percival thought the verse (of Hymn 221)—

> " One army of the Living God,
> To His command we bow;
> Part of the host have cross'd the flood,
> And part are crossing now "

—one of the finest in the whole range of hymnody.

The late Dr Butler of Trinity College, Cambridge, shared this opinion about this great hymn of the Church Militant and Church Triumphant.

A recent instance of the far-reaching influence of this hymn is given in a paper by Professor H. Paul Douglass in the fifth volume of the Church, Community and State Conference Report, Oxford, 1937. It also shows how much Charles Wesley's hymns have entered into American evangelical religion. (The full reference will be found on page 196 of the Report.) He refers to a child growing up in a wooded countryside where the population has long been dwindling. Another child is born on the prairie two decades after the turning of the sod by the tools of man. When he is five or six the church is twenty-five years old. On this, the anniversary of the first significant span of its life, the community remembers its dead from the beginning of the settlement. The church has no stained glass in its windows, only coloured panels of oiled paper pasted on clear glass. On other strips of paper the country newspaper prints the names of the dead in heavy black type. They in turn are pasted across the windows, and beneath them these words:

> " One family, we dwell in Him,
> One Church above, beneath;
> Tho' now divided by the stream,
> The narrow stream of death."

" Here," writes Dr Douglass, " was a symbolic transaction which projected the remote group of prairie folk into an unseen world."

The two hymns—" O Love Divine, how sweet Thou art!" and " Rejoice, the Lord is King "—have gained in influence by their musical setting. They were both set to music by Handel. In 1826 Samuel Wesley discovered in the Fitz-William Museum at Cambridge the score in Handel's own writing. " Rejoice, the Lord is King " is really a festival hymn, and was included in *Hymns for Our Lord's*

Resurrection, issued in 1746. There are fifteen hymns under this heading, and the following verse from the first of them provides a good example of the smoothly flowing style of Wesley's genius. It is not hard to understand how gladly the multitudes who were gathered into the societies sang these religious songs. Charles Wesley taught Christian doctrine in a popular way through sacred song.

> " Go, tell the followers of your Lord
> Their Jesus is to life restored.
> He lives—that they His life may find;
> He lives to quicken all mankind."

In the hymn " Love Divine, all love excelling " we encounter a matter which affects theological and doctrinal questions in a more profound way, and it is from their theological standpoint that the thirty-two hymns are most profitably considered. " Love Divine " appeared originally with four verses in the group of hymns under the title " Hymns for those who seek and those that have Redemption in the Blood of Jesus Christ." As the hymn appears to-day it has three verses only. The omitted verse raised a far-reaching and burning question in Christian theology. It ran as follows:

> " Breathe, O breathe Thy loving spirit
> Into every troubled breast;
> Let us all in Thee inherit,
> Let us find the second rest.
>
> " Take away our power of sinning;
> Alpha and Omega be;
> End of Faith, as its beginning,
> Set our hearts at liberty."

The famous John Fletcher of Madeley, whom John Wesley wished to succeed himself as the head of the Movement, criticized this verse strongly, and pointed out that the expression " Take away the power of sinning " was far too strong. Can God take away from us the power of sinning without taking away our power of free obedience ?

Hymn 520 is justly popular—especially at the service of holy matrimony—but the profound theological depths into which its language penetrates regarding the Everlasting Love of God are easily overlooked.

" Soldiers of Christ, arise " is a reminder that many of the hymns are verses extracted from long compositions—and

also based largely on biblical study. It belongs to a poem of sixteen verses and is based on Ephesians vi, 13. It was probably called out by the persecutions which the Wesleys and their followers were still enduring in 1749. The hymn is followed in the original collection by another longer one based on the story of the taking of Jericho. Both hymns illustrate the fondness of Wesley for basing his poems on biblical incidents. It is worth remarking that he is known to have used as commentaries in his Bible studies both Matthew Henry and Bengel.

"Ye servants of God, your Master proclaim" is supremely a hymn to be sung at great assemblies and gatherings. This was written definitely in the year of persecution and tumults in 1745, and it serves to remind one that Charles Wesley did not write his hymns in a reflective mood, and from the quiet garden of a country parsonage. Rather his verses were hammered out of his own spiritual experience, like the epistles of St Paul.

"Ye servants of God" surely ranks among the greatest of the hymns, with its emphasis on adoration, worship and praise, and its reminiscences of the Book of the Revelation.

"Jesu, Lover of my soul" is so well known that little needs to be added. Perhaps the most wise criticism is that by Canon Ellerton, who hesitated to include it in a Church Hymnal because it "stood absolutely *upon* the line which separates hymns suitable for public worship from those of private devotion." John Wesley himself was careful to avoid too great approach to familiarity in addressing Christ. Bishop Wordsworth objected to the hymn being sung by a large mixed congregation.

Mr Gladstone also criticized this hymn in the same strain. There is an interesting chapter in a book entitled *After Thoughts*, by W. E. Russell, published in 1912. It is entitled "Gladstone on Hymns." The author described how he arranged a dinner party for a number of young liberals—including Canon Scott Holland and Arthur Stanton—to meet Gladstone, who discussed hymns instead of politics, and later sent to the author a long written criticism of "Jesu, Lover of my soul."

2. *Hymns for Holy Communion.*—In *Hymns A. and M.* there are six by Charles Wesley. They are Nos. 554, 556, 718, 720, 723 and 724. Behind the Holy Communion hymns of the Wesleys there lies interesting religious history.

In the year 1745—again, be it noted, the year of the bitter persecutions—there was published at Bristol by Felix Farley an outstanding volume of hymns by "John and Charles Wesley, Presbyters of the Church of England." This was called *Hymns on the Lord's Supper*, and consisted of no less than 166 separate compositions. It began with a lengthy preface extracted from Dr Bevint. This interesting theologian was in 1638 a Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford, and subsequently the pastor of a French Protestant congregation in Normandy, where he was also Chaplain to Marshal Turenne. He returned to England in 1661, was made Dean of Lincoln in 1681, and died there in 1695.

The 166 hymns are divided into six sections. The headings over each section speak for themselves: (1) The Lord's Supper as it is a memorial of the sufferings and death of Christ; (2) As it is a sign and a means of grace; (3) The Sacrament as a pledge of Heaven; (4) The Holy Eucharist as it implies a sacrifice; (5) Concerning the sacrifice of our persons; (6) After the Sacrament. To attempt a detailed discussion of the doctrinal teaching in the hymns written by Charles Wesley for use at the Lord's Supper goes beyond the limits of this essay.

Let it be noted how all through their lives the two brothers laid great stress on attendance at the Holy Communion. In the third year after the change that came to him in 1738 John Wesley took communion ninety-one times—that is, on the average, every four days. On January 29, 1744, Charles notes, "I assisted my brother and Mr Gordon in administering to almost our whole society of 2,000."

In 1743 a congregation at Seven Dials had to be divided into three parts, so that there might not be more than 600 at once.

When he published the *Hymns on the Lord's Supper* he knew that there would be plenty of communicants to welcome this devotional manual.

In the final hymn of these 166 there is a reference to the need of constant communion.

The poet argues that the degeneracy of the age has been caused by the neglect of constant communion.

> "Where is the pure primæval flame
> Which in their faithful bosom glow'd?
> Where are the followers of the Lamb,
> The dying witnesses for God?

Why is the faithful seed decreased,
The life of God extinct and dead?
The Daily Sacrifice is ceased,
And charity to Heaven is fled."

The Wesleys—like their mother Susanna—regarded the Lord's Supper as a converting ordinance.

3. *The Festival Hymns.*—Of these there are only four in *A. and M.* We should realize that the idea of classification according to the Church Seasons had not yet become popular.

Moreover, the Wesleys did not draw up hymn books for church services, but for the preaching house, the open-air service, and the class meeting. Yet Charles has supplied the two most popular hymns for Christmas and Ascension-tide.

4. The fourth group may be termed *Evangelistic and Devotional*, and includes "Wrestling Jacob" (774) and "A charge to keep I have" (702).

John Wesley stated: "Dr Watts did not scruple to say that this single poem, 'Wrestling Jacob,' was worth all the verses he himself had written." This was more than a bereaved man's tribute to a devoted brother. A recent writer has stated: "It may be questioned if any account of evangelical conversion has ever been written in prose or verse comparable with these lines."

This is hardly an overstatement. The story of the soul of Jacob in conflict with the "Fear" of his father Isaac—with Destiny, as the Greeks would have said—becomes a picture of Charles Wesley's struggle with God.

The poet proclaims in the hymn, not only God's everlasting love, but the fact that God seeks man before man seeks God.

The hymn "A charge to keep I have" was not written till 1762—nearly twenty-five years after his experience on Sunday, May 21, 1738—and again reveals Wesley as a biblical student. The hymn is based on Leviticus viii, 35, and is No. 196 in the *Short Hymns on Select Passages.* He had been meditating on "Keep the charge of the Lord that ye die not." It has been said "the genius of Methodism is almost embodied in these lines." The poem certainly combines in the simplest way the twin thoughts of glorifying God by attention to the devotional life and active service in the cause of one's fellow-men. "To serve the present

age" was indeed what both the brothers felt was their vocation. "The hymns on select passages of the Holy Scriptures"—though amounting to many thousands—are of greater interest than the casual reader would imagine. Merely to have one's attention drawn to biblical incidents in such vigorous and vivid verse is a gain. Here is an instance of how Wesley interpreted Numbers xi :

> "Eldad they said, and Medad there
> irregularly bold,
> By Moses uncommission'd dare
> a separate meeting hold:
> and still whom none, but Heaven, will own,
> Men whom the world decry,
> Men authorized by God alone
> presume to prophesy."

This verse raises the controversial question of holy orders and ordination, and the status of local preachers, and of Charles Wesley's churchmanship, which was stronger than that of his brother.

An Anglican clergyman pondering over the hymns of Charles Wesley must inevitably reflect on the greatness of the debt which the Anglican Communion owes to the Wesleys in this matter of sacred song. Both John and Charles have placed the Church of England—to say nothing of other parts of the Church—under a lasting spiritual obligation. Like all outstanding teachers of the people, John Wesley recognized the supreme value of verse and song as the means of communicating ideas and feelings. When, therefore, he understood the reality of his brother's gift for verse, he utilized it to the full. One of the marks of Methodism, both then and now, is the stress laid on hymn-singing. If thirty-two hymns are found among the 779 in *A. and M.*, many hundreds are included in the Methodist Hymnals.

In an essay (No. 17) contributed to *Northern Catholicism* by Dr Newton Flew these words occur : "For the piety of the Methodists the ultimate court of appeal is the Hymn Book, especially the hymns of the Wesleys. Our Hymn Book is our Liturgy. It is our Liturgy in both public worship and private prayer." A modern historian writes of the Collection of Hymns of 1779: "This little book ranks in Christian Literature with the Psalms, the Book of Common Prayer and the Canon of the Mass. In its own way it is

perfect, unapproachable, elemental. It is a work of supreme devotional art by a religious genius."

With the judgment we agree. But is this fact generally appreciated? This hymn book contained 525 hymns. Of these, twenty-seven were by John Wesley, one each by George Herbert, S. Wesley and S. Wesley, Junior, two by Dr Henry More, and seven by Dr Watts. By far the greater number of the remaining 486 were by Charles Wesley.

In the preface John writes boldly, since so few of the hymns were his own, and claims that the book had no doggerel, no botches, but possessed the purity, the strength and the elegance of the English language, and at the same time the utmost simplicity and plainness suited to every capacity. Few hymnologists will quarrel with the latest verdict pronounced on Charles Wesley in the recently published *Hymnody Past and Present*, by Dr C. S. Philipps.

"Who shall deny that the man who wrote the hymns mentioned was anything less than one of the greatest hymn-writers of all time? Some have even called him the greatest of all."

One fact is quite certain. The work that under the Holy Spirit John Wesley was enabled to accomplish could not have been carried out without the co-operation of the hymn-singing for which his brother Charles was responsible.

F. H. Durnford.

Church, State, and Mr Gladstone

I.—MR GLADSTONE: THE STATESMAN

I

One hundred years ago an article in the *Edinburgh Review*, No. CXXXIX, April-July, 1839, opened thus:

> The author of this volume is a young man of unblemished character, and of distinguished Parliamentary talents, the rising hope of those stern and unbending Tories, who follow, reluctantly and mutinously, a leader, whose experience and eloquence are indispensable to them, but whose cautious temper and moderate opinions they abhor. It would not be at all strange if Mr Gladstone were one of the most unpopular men in England.

The citation is text enough for at least two disquisitions, the one on the reviewer, and the other on the book reviewed. Both might be profitable and neither would be irrelevant to current issues. Macaulay is to-day not *persona grata* in Catholic and clerical circles. The theologians and Church historians dismiss him as easily and contemptuously and unjustifiably as any up-to-date history don. "He is," say they, "a Whig, an Erastian, a Protestant: away with him." Yet Macaulay is always worth reading for pure pleasure, and (though the suggestion will be received with derision) may it be said that the fifty pages of this very essay *in re Gladstone on Church and State*, by its sound sense, acute argument, patient underlining of the obvious, vivid analogies, charity and courtesy, would be no bad substitute for, or at least introduction to, the perusal of those elaborate Reports recently set forth for our instruction in these politico-ecclesiastical topics?

But we turn from Macaulay and his article. We concede to the modern that *Gladstone on Church and State* may well be numbered among the literary remains of the early Victorian Age which are best forgotten. There is, however, one reason why ardent Gladstonians will wish to preserve the memory of a book of which the reviewer rightly said it was "the measure of what a man can do to be left behind by the world." For this man was not to suffer that fate: his destiny was to grow, not stop; to increase, not decrease; to become the interpreter and exponent of policies and program of which the country as yet had seen neither the necessity nor the desirability. Within five years, say by 1845, that development had already gone far: within twenty-five it was to go farther and faster. *The State in its Relations with the Church*, by W. E. Gladstone, Esq., student of Christ Church and M.P. for Newark, marks, not a dead end, but one early stage in a process of emancipation and illumination. Its author lived to add to what Oxford and Aristotle had taught him—the love of truth—something else which became his other guiding star, "The value of liberty as an essential condition of excellence in all human things." That is why Mr Gladstone ought not to be forgotten to-day when most people are prepared to sacrifice Religion for the sake of Liberty, and at least one great Church is prepared to sacrifice Liberty for the sake of Religion.

To-day, happily, it is not necessary, as it was twenty,

or even ten, years ago, to defend the reputation of Mr Gladstone from supercilious contempt; the smart witticisms and the clever superiorities of the post-war generation have followed the partisan animosities of the eighties into extinction. Twenty years ago the eulogist would have been able to rely only on the testimonies of a few outmoded and inconsiderable survivors of his own generation—on Acton, the Catholic and most erudite student of history and contemporary affairs; on Morley, the most accomplished of the philosophic Radicals; on Bryce, the Scotch Presbyterian, lawyer, historian, ambassador and champion of friendless peoples. To these three Mr Gladstone was the greatest man they had known, met, or read of. The Catholic student placed him higher than Hamilton, Cavour, Chatham, Pitt, Peel, and remarked that Mr Gladstone's rivals, like the generals of Alexander, divide his gifts. The Utilitarian rationalist, who was his intimate colleague of the later years, who had access to every self-revealing scrap of paper about his hero, dwelling on Gladstone's lifelong devotion to Dante, names him as the supreme leader in the long transition from the medieval to the modern state. The Presbyterian turns to the metaphor more often employed than deserved: that of " the eagle soaring high in the air and seeing far-off things as well as the near things." But what, twenty years ago, were Acton, Morley, Bryce to the intellectual modern men who write books or deliver discourses? They were dead and gone, and the fame of Mr Gladstone suffered the customary eclipse; like less eminent Victorians, he was condemned or patronized by a literary sect to whom one might apply Disraeli's description of the Peelites: "A limited but accomplished school." This school had its day—they ministered to a fashion which lasted, we may say, just as long as the " Peace " of Versailles. The last five years, however, have taught the clerisy, and some of their readers and auditors, that mere accomplishments, mostly exercised in belittling progenitors, are worse than useless when the gales begin to blow and men have to look to the foundation of their State and Order. So it is that within the last decade the turn of the tide has come; the eclipse is over, Mr Gladstone has come back, it is now possible to talk of him with respect, admiration and reverence and not be suspected of indulging in a species of sly and heavy humour. That change is one of the most significant, as it is one of the

most undeniable, facts in the intellectual situation of the present hour.

The poorly recompensed labours of industrious historians may count for one straw indicating the direction of the wind. Last year, for instance, saw the appearance of two important studies: Mr J. L. Hammond's intensive monograph on Mr Gladstone's Irish policy, and Dr Erich Eyck's fresh survey of the whole career. Another German, Dr Rudolf Craemer, secured a surprising success with his *Gladstone als Christliche Staatsmann* just before the ban on all things liberal fell in 1933.

More cogent, perhaps, is proof of a different kind: Max Beerbohm's National Lecture of July 26, 1936. That discourse, besides being by Max Beerbohm, was remarkable for two things: first, it was obvious, though he did not say so, that Max's hero among the Victorians was Mr Gladstone, under whose spell he fell *malgré lui* ; second, for that delightful little flashlight picture of the two society dames holding converse some two years before. Said one (an Asquithian Liberal): "We admire Mr Gladstone, but, of course, people only talk of Dizzy; Gladstone's forgotten." Said the other (a Tory), " Oh, I thought he was comin' in again, my dear." The Tory dame turned social diagnostician was quite correct; Gladstonian stock is rising and will rise higher as every passing year brings into view some new illustration, for our encouragement or warning, of those principles which in steadfast patience he learned and taught and wrought out through sixty years of arduous controversy and conflict. From Morley to Max is, after all, no small span, whether the measure be one of time or of temper; this variety of testimony will at any rate be enough to provide a *prima facie* justification for the plea that the study of Mr Gladstone's life and career is most relevant to our present discontents, distresses, necessities, hopes and fears.

II

His trade was the government of men; he was politician, party-chief, statesman; more precisely he was easily the most outstanding political leader in the years of transition from Aristocracy to Democracy, from the compact little England of 1830 to the collectivist, imperialist, far-flung Commonwealth of 1900. Hence the relevance of Mr Gladstone as a statesman; you cannot understand your

own age unless you understand the age of your fathers, and you can best understand their age as it was reflected in what he taught and wrought—and on occasion in what he failed to do, but which we have had to do since (*e.g.*, the words of the woodman leaning on his axe, as he received the summons to Windsor, December 1, 1868: " My mission is to pacify Ireland "). If one brief word may buttress that large assertion, it is that Mr Gladstone was pre-eminent in uniting the two necessary elements of political power: a philosophy of society and also legislative and administrative talent of the highest order. He had stars to steer by and also the ability to relate the ideal to the possible, to pursue fixed aims past public clamour and Parliamentary opposition to a partial, if not always to a complete, realization.

As to the first of these two endowments, it will be enough to remark that one who from his early manhood had counted Aristotle and St Augustine among his four " doctors " was bound to be a political theorist. His first essay in authorship was, to quote Macaulay, " a grave and elaborate treatise on an important part of the Philosophy of Government," and the young author then rising to eminence in the House of Commons did not, as Macaulay feared, allow his talent for debate to impair his taste for close reasoning and high speculation. Mr Gladstone had turned sixty when he told Manning, " My ' Pope ' is Bishop Butler."[1] Hence, further, following such doctors through life it was inevitable that he should become, not only a political philosopher, but, as well, something of a theologian. Nature and nurture had marked him out to tread those highways and by-ways which run along the undemarcated frontier where politics and theology meet. " I always," he told Lord Rosebery in 1880, " admired Mr Grote's saying that politics and theology were the only two great subjects." It was, of course, that direction of his mind which gave such interest, zest, and profit to his friendships with Döllinger and Acton. Acton it was who remarked to Dr G. P. Gooch that, despite their differences on religion, Gladstone loved Morley because Morley was the only one of his colleagues who really cared for political theory. Few practising politicians, in short, have thought deeper and longer on the high themes treated of in the textbooks: of the State and Society, of Liberty and Order, of Law and Authority, of Industry and Commerce, above all, of Churches, Corporations, Associations

[1] British Museum Add. MSS., 44541/262.

and Groups, and of their position, rights and duties, *vis-à-vis* the Great Leviathan; that is one ground of Mr Gladstone's claim to be numbered among the great; it is also one reason for his lively remembrance in the present juncture of human affairs.

Secondly, Mr Gladstone was not only, as Carlyle said to Emerson, " an Oxford crack scholar, devout churchman . . . a solid, serious, silent-minded man," tinged with " Coleridge shovel-hattism "; he became, as all the world knows, one of the ablest financiers, administrators, parliamentarians of his century. Our generation, inured to an efficient bureaucratic collectivism, is not likely to pay much heed to an elaborate recital of Mr Gladstone's pioneer achievements in laying the financial and administrative foundations of the modern socialized State. Only the historically minded, only the grateful commemorators of bygone benefactors, will stay to recall a statesman who, even while Palmerston was still alive, inaugurated that renovation of financial and governmental routine which is both the sign and the seal of health in the body politic. He brought the severer standards of the business house into easy-going and inefficient Whitehall offices; he restored right and proper relationships between the Treasury, the City and the Bank; he used financial leverage to cheapen posts, periodicals and transport, and, by these and other labours, taught the nation to take a lively interest in its balance sheet. No single financial phenomenon is more often referred to to-day, as proof of the stability and vitality of our social state, than the Post Office Savings Bank, with its thousands of depositors and millions of money. But few remember that the inauguration thereof was one move in Mr Gladstone's crusade against the Bank of England (" I was opposed by the Governor and Deputy Governor, who had seats in Parliament, and had the City for an antagonist," Morley, II, p. 651). The successful issue of that fight was one of the " five major legislative achievements " which gave him special pleasure when the time came for retrospect, but it was not the only victory he won for the thrifty artisan and the black-coated worker. " In politics," he wrote in the last entry of the famous diaries, " the basis of my mind is laid principally in finance and philanthropy " —no bad conjunction, and both were a living part of his conception of the duty and calling of a Christian statesman. " Finance and philanthropy "; to add, by way of further

illustration, Franchise Reform; Local Government, county and municipal; Education, elementary, technical, university; the removal of medieval and Hanoverian civil disabilities, is to recall Morley's reflection that Mr Gladstone, alone among the churchmen of the High Oxford School, understood what the modern state was to be. On that, as some may think, double-edged encomium, the Editor may permit a future note. There is at least no practical possibility that English churchmen in the modern state can turn back the wheel of time; there is no returning to the England of Mr Gladstone's youth and middle age. And if there is merit in seeing when " those great social forces which move onwards in their might and majesty " have reached a point when the only alternatives are revolution or reform, then clearly no other Victorian party-leader showed such tact and deliberation, wisdom and decision, in negotiating the rocks and whirlpools of constitutional change—Tennyson notwithstanding. Those great forces are " mighty," whether or no we think them " majestic," and up to a point the wise shepherd must let the flock move on whither it will, grateful enough if he be able to turn the sheep from cliffs and crags on the left or bogs and morasses on the right. To change the figure, no statesman deserves warmer plaudits from posterity than he who, recognizing that the caravan is on the move, keeps it moving along the middle track of ordered progress, avoiding on either side the fatal opposites of revolution and reaction, of destruction and stagnation.

III

Precisely the same merit marks that other range of this vast career: Britain's relationships with foreign states and alien ideologies. Among Mr Gladstone's miscalculations was the presentiment (expressed to the Warden of Glenalmond) in 1865 that his political life was drawing to a close. Actually there lay beyond that term the two last and most arduous enterprises: the pacification of Ireland and the attempted resolution of the Near Eastern imbroglio—crusades which were to bring against him the most rabid antagonism and virulent hostility. Both touch the overwhelming problem of our own day and of all days: the due and just reconciliation of the rights of the strong and of the weak, of Imperialism and Nationalism, of Empire and small State, of big brother and little brother—the problem which

we Britishers take leave to think our race alone has succeeded in resolving.

Gladstonian Foreign Policy rested on the " dual basis " of appeasement and firmness; he embraced the principle early and held it to the end. We can trace its ingemination in and from the year 1850—a point in his pilgrimage that accounts for much that was to follow. It was the year of the visit to Naples, whence he returned flaming with righteous indignation, urging Lord Aberdeen to swift and strong protest against the tyrants still lingering in the shades of eighteenth-century reaction; it was also the year of his great speech in the Don Pacifico Debate. Incidentally that oration, one of his Parliamentary triumphs, gives the lie to the common but inaccurate observation that Mr Gladstone's speeches do not bear re-reading; it was full of fire, wit, irony, argumentative detail. In the region of general principle it was a reminder to the fiery spirits of that Palmerstonian House of Commons that this country cannot, and should not, conduct its diplomacy from the self-chosen vantage-point of moral superiority, nor undertake with dignity or safety to interfere in ideological conflicts in Europe or elsewhere. Popular impressions, having their origin in vague memories of " Midlothian," often portray Mr Gladstone as a demagogue rousing his countrymen to a frenzy of moral sentimentality by way of prelude to armed intervention regardless of time, opportunity or possible outcome. No impression could be falser to the fact. In 1850 at Westminster, as in 1896 at Liverpool, he strongly affirmed the contrary: he denied that the people of this country possess " a mission to be the censors of vice and folly, of abuse and imperfection among other countries of the world, to be the universal schoolmasters." Such pretensions are foolish and dangerous; to encourage them is not the business of a British Foreign Secretary; his rôle is emphatically not that of a medieval knight challenging all comers to the tournament. " I understand it to be his duty to conciliate peace with dignity " . . . " Interference in foreign countries, Sir, according to my mind, should be rare, deliberate, decisive in character and effectual for its end." Those two *obiter dicta* from the speech of 1850, read in conjunction with the last of the innumerable platform orations—that at Hengler's Circus, Liverpool, August 24, 1896—show how steadily for half a century the compass needle had pointed in the line of Bagehot's " animated moderation."

In a remarkable way that "last great deliverance to a public audience" might have served a British Prime Minister or Foreign Secretary during last year's "crisis"—reading Czecho-Slovakia for Armenia, the Treaty of Versailles for the Treaty of Berlin; there are arguments and phrasing which might have been an anticipation of the case for the foreign policy behind which most Englishmen are to-day aligned. So much so is that true that it is a safe surmise that, as and when the Gladstone Papers at the Museum become accessible to the oncoming cohorts of historical researchers, an indefinite number of theses, studies, monographs will be compiled demonstrating that the spirit and method of the National (Conservative) Administration of the mid-decades of this century were in line with the professions and principles, not of Palmerston the Whig nor of Disraeli the Tory, but of the Gladstone-Granville régime just before the comparatively brief day of pure nineteenth-century Liberalism closed in heresies and schisms. They will say—or the more moralistic among them will say—that in those regions where party allegiance is submerged by deeper tides, Baldwin and Chamberlain and Halifax refreshed their spirits at the same spring of spiritual reinforcement as the Liberal leader of the last century; they may even quote Psalm vii, 12, as one of those "words of scripture" noted in the diaries in times of special crisis. The international problems of Mr Gladstone and his generation were set for them by the Treaty of Vienna as ours have been by the Treaty of Versailles, and we may be sure that it is within the circle of his insight and by the light of his example that we shall best conserve that "ordered liberty" which we desire for ourselves and for others, best maintain and transmit to posterity "those sacred principles that govern and harmonize the intercourse of states."

W. G. Addison.

MISCELLANEA

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. T. O. Wedel, Ph.D., is a Canon of Washington Cathedral and Director of Studies at the College of Preachers. Before he entered holy orders he was for some years Professor of English Literature at Carleton College.

The Rev. O. C. Quick, D.D., has recently been appointed Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford and Canon of Christ Church.

The Rev. F. H. Durnford is Vicar of Long Houghton, Northumberland.

The Rev. W. G. Addison is Rector of Zeals, Wilts.

The Rev. H. C. L. Heywood is Fellow and Dean of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge.

Mr Brandeth was Master of the Seven Years' Association in Sheffield, 1934-9; he has written several articles on Reunion.

NOTES

"FACT" AND "SIGNIFICANCE" IN THE GOSPELS

It must seem absurd at such a time to pursue a speculative point; but if Theology continues to be published it is allowable to discuss theology.

In his article which appeared in the September number, Mr Richardson follows Professor Dodd in denying that there are "bare facts," and in asserting that facts are inseparable from their meanings: from which the conclusion is drawn that it is less important than we once supposed to distinguish the history of the years A.D. 1-30 from the faith of the early Church about them. I should like to make some comments on this.

1. The "meaning of a fact" is a very confused notion and better not employed. History is concerned with what *was*. Either the meaning is part of this or it is not.

2. The proper object of history is the personal experience or act: history is a sort of extended memory. If a "bare fact" means a physical event as such, it is not the object of history. But it is the fact that so and so, in performing an action, was reacting to certain actual knowledge and had a certain intention. It may be difficult to approximate at all closely to the reconstruction of such real personal events: but in so far as we succeed we approach the goal of history.

3. An event may be considered as it was in itself when it occurred: it is of this we have just spoken. It may also be considered as a condition of other and subsequent real events. But then it is being considered, not in itself, but as a constituent of those other events when they come to occur. The mind and intention and experience of Socrates dying is one thing, and its date is that of his death. This event as an object of Plato's

contemplation and a determinant of his thought is another, and its date is the date of such behaviour on Plato's part.

4. Although the proper object of history is events as they are in themselves, the principle for the *selection* of them by the historian is their importance as constituents of further events. This is often called their " significance " or " meaning." But it must be understood that to speak so is to anticipate. The " causativeness " of events does not belong to them actually until they begin to cause, anyhow not in a field where free will operates. The real action in the case of Plato's contemplation is the action of Plato, not Socrates: it is Plato's free act which makes Socrates' death a " cause " in this respect.

5. If we speak of the forward-looking significance of an act we may mean several things:

(*a*) It is *worthy* to play a certain rôle in determining reactions on the part of certain men or of men in general.

(*b*) It is *likely* to do so, according to averages of human behaviour established by observation of other instances.

(*c*) It has *actually* done so, for we are in a position to look back and check the results.

6. It seems that Mr Richardson and Professor Dodd are concerned with (*c*), adding an undercurrent of (*a*): but let it be understood that (*c*) really belongs (from the historical point of view) to the history of the Apostles and the Church, and it is not part of the " fact of Christ " as such: *unless we import theology*, and suppose a divine intention of the consequences as already actual in the original fact. But this is to go beyond history as history. But setting this aside, what do we find they have to tell us? That the Christian Revelation consists not of the original facts alone, but of those further facts also which are the inspired responses of the Apostles and the Church: a view very agreeable with St Paul and St John. But what is the conclusion? That legendary or theological developments in the Gospels are not valueless because, though they do not belong to the first part of revelation, they do to the second.

But it remains as important as ever to distinguish the two, and to establish the solidity of the first (the original Gospel facts). Only then can we attribute to these their actual later consequences under the form of a divine intention implicit in them.

What the Apostles in fact did was to recognize a unique divine action in the sequence of events, beginning with the Gospel facts and continuing in the inspired responses of the Church. We have the choice of either accepting their testimony unchecked or reconstructing according to our ability the whole sequence which they so interpreted, to see whether it bears their interpretation. And we can hardly do this if we have the beginning, middle and end of the story inextricably confused.

Austin Farrer.

CORRESPONDENCE

ECCLESIASTICAL TRANSCENDENTALISM?

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

I value THEOLOGY in its new form so highly, I am so much in sympathy with its spirit and tone, and I know so well what a great influence it has on the minds of many clergy, that I would respectfully protest against what seems to me to be the lack of balance in your Editorial in this month's issue. In particular, I would refer to four passages.

(1) You say (p. 245), "The leaders of the Church, like the leaders of the state (*sic*), are too deeply committed to the maintenance of existing institutions to permit the hope that they will become pioneers of a movement which would undermine the positions which they at present occupy." I ask, "What are these positions?" and "Who are these leaders?" Is not the Editor of THEOLOGY among them? Yet his words do not sound like a confession. Is a Diocesan Bishop to be included? Am I? Then I should be grateful to learn on what evidence you ground this statement. Such vague discrediting of "leaders of the Church" in general seems to me a real disservice to the Church, especially in days like these.

(2) You say, on the same page, that you "trust that Christian thinkers will warn the nation of the grave prospect that lies ahead"—and the prospect referred to is suggested in your previous paragraph. I ask whether this is obviously the right moment for such warning. Why should Christian thinkers be advised to address the nation just in the moment of its agony on the subject of further vaguely described horrors yet to come? Such a suggestion seems to me hardly to reveal the understanding sympathy of a priestly heart. Anyway, there is another side—"Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof" and "You cannot bear them now."

(3) On page 244 you say, "So far there are ominous signs that the Churches are going to repeat the record of 1914-18." What, I ask again, does this mean? The suggestion, I imagine, is that this record was, for example that of the Church of England, disgraceful; and I think you have it in mind that the ministry of the Anglican clergy in the years 1914-18 was lamentably nationalistic and "jingo." I know that some take this view, but here again there is another side. I had some experience of the work of the ministry at the time, and I was at pains not long ago to make a rather special study of literature put out in the name of the Church of England during the Great War; and in my judgment, except for one or two utterances by a few Bishops and clergy, which have been quoted *ad nauseam* by critics in recent years,

the work and teaching of the great majority of Anglican clergy in this country during 1914-18 was wonderfully sound and true, and I believe that they resolved the very difficult problem of doing their duty to a Church which is at once Catholic and National more successfully than you do in this Editorial. In my view, the people who make these vague charges about the failure of the Church of England and of its clergy in the years 1914-18 are doing many of the clergy in those years a great wrong.

(4) In the same paragraph you ask, " Will the clergy show Christians that in practice we are Christians first, and Germans and Englishmen after that in order of importance ?" This is what, I would claim, very many of them did in 1914-18, and I have no doubt that they will succeed in doing it again. But your thinking here, Sir, seems to end where one might have hoped that it would begin. For the whole implication of your Editorial seems to me to be that we can be Christians with part of our being, removed from this present struggle, and that we can be in it as Englishmen, if at all, with another part of our being. But the problem really lies *not* in being Christians first and Englishmen afterwards, *but* in being Christian-Englishmen (or, if you like, English-Christians).

Certainly we clergy have an immensely difficult task at this time in being true to both sides of the tension which is inherent in our status as priests of the Universal Church in a particular nation which is engaged in such a struggle as this present. I sincerely hope that THEOLOGY is going to assist us in our difficulties. But THEOLOGY will not help us if it refuses to face the fact that there is this tension which I have mentioned, or suggests that we should begin to resolve it by cutting ourselves in two.

May I conclude by saying that of course there is much in your Editorial for which I feel grateful, and that I still cherish the hope that you are going to deal with the other side of the case next time.

Yours faithfully,
MERVYN COVENTRY.

THE BISHOP'S HOUSE, COVENTRY.
October 4, 1939.

[We admit that there was a certain lack of balance in last month's Editorial, which was not altogether unintended. We have tried to redress the balance this month, though not apparently in the way that the Bishop of Coventry would wish. As regards the statements to which he takes exception: (1) The passage which we quoted from Drucker's *End of Economic Man* in order to enforce the sentence in question is applicable to all churchmen, and therefore implied our own confession. But if what Drucker says is at all true, it is most conspicuously true of those in official positions of leadership. The Editor of THEOLOGY, since he has not official responsibility for administering the ecclesi-

astical system, may be more free than a diocesan bishop to make public acknowledgment of its present frustration. (2) We allude to this point in this month's Editorial. (3) We feel bound to contrast the Bishop of Coventry's judgment on this point with that of the Bishop of Chichester, who can claim, as Resident Chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury during the last war, to have had peculiar opportunities of observation (see *Chichester Diocesan Gazette*, October, 1939, p. 7). We had not in mind, however, to say that the Anglican clergy in the years 1914-18 were "jingo," but that the Church did not then adequately fulfil its prophetic function. If, in fact, it did so, then we have over-estimated its prophetic function. (4) We admit the problem, but we are less confident than the Bishop that there is no danger of the development here of a counterpart to the Christianity of the "German Christians."—Ed. Theology.]

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

The very important and valuable Editorial which appears in your October number seems to me to show in some respects a defective apprehension of the real issues which confront the Church in the present conflict. And perhaps you will allow me to make some observations upon the subject.

It is, I think, generally agreed that the most serious feature in the life of modern Europe is the collapse of all commonly acknowledged standards of morality; and this fact in itself places the Church in an altogether new situation. During the past centuries of European history the validity of certain broad and basic moral principles, however frequently these were transgressed in practice, was commonly acknowledged by all, whatever their religious profession. In those circumstances the Church seemed to have no need to concern itself in any special way with teaching or upholding those moral principles. It could take them for granted, and by that very fact it was led naturally, if mistakenly, to suppose that it could confine itself to its characteristic gospel of repentance, redemption, and new life in Christ. Those who found themselves unable to accept that gospel believed themselves to differ from the Church only on questions of theology and dogma—the fundamental nature and content of ordinary morality were not in question. Roughly speaking, justice and truthfulness meant the same for everybody.

But now the advent of Communism and Nazism has changed the whole situation. The duties of justice and truthfulness, as they have been commonly understood by civilized man, are now repudiated by the most powerful leaders of European life and thought. Even in this country men are asking, Is there a moral law at all? If the Church does not concern itself to teach and uphold the authority of that law, who or what else can do so? The Church has two alternatives open to it. Either it can teach and uphold the moral law as well as its own gospel,

while making clear the distinction between them, or else it can confine itself to its gospel, while it acquiesces or even joins in the discrediting of the moral law.

Your Editorial urges in effect that the Church ought to take the second of these alternatives (though you somewhat confuse the issue by speaking as though morality always meant self-righteousness). I cannot agree with you. Let me explain myself. I do agree with you entirely that in regard to man the point of view of the gospel is quite distinct from that of mere morality. From the moral point of view man is inherently the subject of rights and the object of duties: from the point of view of the gospel man is inherently the subject of sin and the object of grace. From the first point of view distinctions of *merit* have importance—morality judges one man or action to be better or worse than another: from the second point of view such distinctions vanish—all alike are sinners. Nevertheless, the second point of view somehow presupposes the validity of the first; for if man has not culpably transgressed the moral law, there is no meaning in forgiveness.

Now is it really desirable that the Church, which is surely called to lead men not only in faith but also in morals, should forsake the moral point of view altogether and confine itself to that of the gospel? What would be the consequences of its doing so in England to-day? It would certainly cease (as you are so eager that it should cease) to support the morale of the nation. It would, in fact, be doing its best, in the strictest sense of the word, to demoralize it. Let us be quite clear on this point. The moral danger of the moment is not only, and not chiefly, that the Church should be led into merely supporting the nation's cause and ministering to national self-righteousness. At present this danger, though real, seems to me comparatively remote. The much more pressing danger is that men should regard war, because it is so horrible and loathsome to them, as being necessarily something quite immoral, that they should feel that a just war is a contradiction in terms, and therefore all moral standards are abrogated while war lasts. This is the demoralization from which I think the Church ought to guard the nation and which, if it follows your counsel, it would inevitably encourage. Just because war is so horrible, it ought only to be undertaken as an absolute moral duty or not at all.

If I understand you aright, you would on the whole welcome a certain demoralization of the nation, on the ground that it would hasten repentance, social revolution and the construction of a new Christian social order (or "integration") upon the ruins of the old. I hope I am as eager as you are for a radical reconstruction of the social order, though I do not believe that Christ would ever have us destroy morality in order to promote religion, or deliberately exasperate evil that good may come. But I think you are misled at this point by a failure to perceive

that it is impossible for a man to take the gospel-view of sin until he has already believed the gospel. It is only in the light of accepted gospel-faith and grace that the truth that all men are equally sinners can appear. Seen otherwise than in this light, human equality in sin is not a truth but a falsehood, and to accept it undermines morality instead of transcending it. Simply to destroy the moral self-respect of a man or a nation is simply demoralizing, and can only stop their ears, not open them, to the gospel-word.

Moreover, we need to think more clearly about this notion of a Christian social order. A social order which would embody and express the Christian gospel seems to me to be a typical dream of that romantic idealism which you are so anxious to disclaim. A right social order embodies and expresses *law*, and a legalized gospel is a contradiction in terms. The social order which we should strive to create is one which would promote justice and liberty and protect human rights in such a way as to give free course to the gospel of God's love and thus help it to convict men of sin in the deepest and most hopeful sense. If the Church is not to concern itself with questions of law, justice, and human rights, it can have no part to play in social reconstruction.

I can sum up my criticisms of your Editorial in a sentence by saying that it seems to me to argue as though Christianity were a religion of one Testament and not of two. In particular, I cannot agree with you when you say that there is no allegiance which may make on us an absolute claim but allegiance to God's holy Word in Jesus Christ. For this assertion denies by implication the absolute authority of conscience by which, however imperfectly, men everywhere apprehend God's moral law.

May I say in conclusion that I think it quite likely that I have misunderstood and misrepresented your meaning? I nevertheless think it worth while to record my impressions, because discussion of the points raised is so greatly needed.

Oliver C. Quick.

The College, Durham.
October 5, 1939.

[If we disagree with Canon Quick, it is, we think, less about general principles than about their application to the present situation. We have also received a large number of letters that warmly approve the Editorial.—Ed. Theology.]

COMMENT ON LITERARY PERIODICALS

In the September number of *Scrutiny*[1] the claims of political activity upon the time and energy of writers and thinkers are discussed in a series of short articles. None of these is by a regular contributor. The political views of the authors differ widely, but they are all concerned to preserve what Mr Christopher Dawson calls the " community of thought," " a common tradition of culture which transcends politics and, to some extent, even nationality." Mr Olaf Stapledon writes sympathetically but firmly of his friends on the Left: " Some earnest political people naively suppose that, even if for the sake of political victory we have to neglect and violate the civilized spirit for a while, we shall easily restore it when the trouble is over. This is a tragic error. In betraying the spirit we betray the citadel, no matter how many superficial victories we win in the field. In this conflict we must not adopt the enemy's methods. As well might birds seek to conquer fishes by plunging under water with them and holding them till they drown."

Miss Stebbing has some acute things to say about philosophers and their use. Mr R. H. Tawney appeals to *Scrutiny* to do for political writing what it has done for other forms of literature. " The cure . . . is not a new body of political doctrines, but a new rigour in dealing with all doctrines, whether new or old. It is to judge them by some standard more permanent and exacting than the fashions of the moment." But if other things than literature in the ordinary sense are to be so judged, the relation between literary standards and other " permanent and exacting " standards will have to be made more explicit. Mr Michael Oakeshott, Mr Geoffrey Davies, Mr Richard Church and the present reviewer also inserted oars.

The rest of the number consists of the first part of a long study of literary criticism in France by Mr Martin Turnell, a musical article with illustrations, and an exceedingly interesting elaboration by Mr A. R. Humphreys of certain hints by Coleridge upon Latin verse composition at school in its effects upon English poetry when other countervailing influences were lacking. Dr Leavis protests against Dr P. G. Wodehouse. The reviews include an appreciation of Mr Wyndham Lewis's last book of essays and manifestos, and an interesting criticism of Mr Muir's introduction to " The Present Age " in literature. We note that Mr Denys Thompson is no longer an editor.

It would be a great pity if *Scrutiny* died. *The Adelphi*[2] is in a more doubtful case, if Mr Murry has now another platform in the *Times Literary Supplement*. (It is remarkable that he should

[1] Deighton Bell and Co., Cambridge. 10s. a year, post free.
[2] 12, Woodside, Erskine Hill, N.W. 11.

have three signed articles in the first month of war.) Moreover, Mr Murry's pacifism has been so far qualified by the increasing sense of fundamental complexities which his conversion to Christian orthodoxy has engendered that the editor and audience of *The Adelphi* may not be very happy about it. The editor and he have a friendly controversy in the August number, which turns, like the *Scrutiny* symposium, upon the precise meaning of political activity. The rest of the August and September numbers are not very remarkable, but Mr Geoffrey West contributes some remarks on the biography of authors, with special reference to Melville, which seem to me very cogent; and in the September number there is an unusually cool and objective journal of a visit to Italian North Africa.

It is to be hoped that *The New English Weekly*[1] will not die. Their editorial notes on "The Perils of Righteousness" (September 14) and their correspondence columns on the same day (*cf.* a letter from Mr T. S. Eliot) suggest that a weekly forum might be sustained there of the utmost importance. Now that the Left is dished by the Soviet, intelligent criticism of the *aims* of the Government is most likely to come from those who have in a measure foreseen the present situation, and do not blame them simply for their failure to outbid Ribbentrop in Moscow.

GEORGE EVERY, S.S.M.

INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS ON THE HISTORY OF ART

THERE were no art exhibitions last month, because of the war. But the 15th International Congress on the History of Art was held last July in London; and sitting listening for the air-raid sirens seems a suitable time to write about something International. Almost 200 papers on every variety of subject were read at the Congress, and, only the abstracts of these being available, it is impossible to do anything more than briefly to indicate their scope.

Unfortunately, the vast majority of the papers were highly specialized and only academic in interest, so that the Congress, in lacking an over-all plan, seemed to miss the opportunity presented by the meeting together of so many specialists. Almost every specialist, in pursuing his own subject, failed to see the wood for the trees, and in common with practically all other academic subjects the History of Art seems thoroughly lost in the wood. As was expressed in a paper by Professor Paulsson of Upsala: "The History of Art must tend towards other ends

[1] 7 and 8, Rolls Passage, Chancery Lane, E.C. 4.

than to establish a gigantic Corpus of Art of all times and countries, about the proper values of which it knows nothing."

However, some of the separate papers read were interesting in themselves. M. Brière described a project taking place in France for replacing in the churches and chapels the fine ecclesiastical ornaments of the past, which have hitherto been in museums and private collections. Another paper by Professor Escher of Zurich traced the development of Protestant church architecture; the familiar galleries on columns and arches evidently originating in the chapels in the castles of the Protestant princes of the Reformation. Although William Blake's literature is studied in England, his drawings and paintings are very much neglected, and it was left to a Parisian, G. Wildenstein, to talk about Blake, finding significant connexions between his art and French mysticism of the nineteenth century.

Although these papers, and the majority of the many others, dealt with Christian art of one sort or another, and although there was an evident sympathy with Christianity, yet there was rarely any attempt to connect the trends of Christian theology and art together. It is distressing to find that in the few papers which did investigate the relationship between art and belief, the latter was non-Christian. Thus Dr Rosenau of London traced the architectural development of the synagogue ; showing how " the relative stability of the religious purpose and the lack of hierarchy in Judaism account for the permanent stability of the ground plan of the synagogue, and the emphasis given to abstract and symbolic architectural representations, as well as the stress laid on orientation. Where human and animal forms are found, the importance of forces alien to Judaism can be clearly shown. How these forces were absorbed and transformed by the Jewish religion makes a contribution to the problem of the place of religion in art."

Professor Frey of Breslau, apparently a disciple of Nazism, was concerned in showing the racial characteristics of medieval art. The Nazi doctrines are bound up with the German language and seem meaningless when translated, but a typical sentence was: " Die nationale Stilbildung zeigt sich dabei trotz vielfacher Beeinflussung und Überschichtung eine gewisse Kontinuität und das Durchdringen eines gegenüber dem zeitlichen Wandel beharrenden Faktors, der im Charakter des Folkes, seinen Lebensbedingungen und seiner sozialen und politischen Struktur begründet ist."

Not one of the speakers considered *Christianity* as a positive power influencing art forms, although several did bring Christian considerations into their discussions in a partial way. For instance, Professor Puyvelde of Brussels emphasized the Flemish as distinct from the Italian Renaissance, showing the spiritual vitality of the former. He then traced the development of the " primitive " style of the fifteenth century into the " baroque "

of the seventeenth century, finding the whole motive for this development in the spiritual aspirations of the Reformation, as expressed in such artists as Holbein, Cranach, and Dürer.

The necessity of such spiritual insight for the understanding of the history of art was stressed in a paper by Mme Zimmermann on *The Problem of Principles and Criteria in Art.* She distinguished between " Kunstwissenschaft " (mere intellectuality in art) and " Kunstwollen " (the essence of art), and the latter is what " has proclaimed itself from the most remote ages as the active autonomous power of Human Creative Spirituality." On the other hand, the determination of principles and criteria in art must involve intellectuality, and this " seems to want to determine the constitutive values of art *without* spirituality, and to paralyse artistic sensibility "; and she suggests that this paradoxical situation " shows the error of any materialistic interpretation of the concept *Art*, and why artistic activity at present is merging into metaphysics."

However that may be, the History and Criticism of Art is a sadly neglected subject, and even in the universities there are no Faculties for the plastic arts, as there are for music and literature. All the art galleries are now stowing away their precious contents into places of safety, but it seems futile to preserve our Byzantine and Medieval treasures, our Velasquezs and our Gainsboroughs, if the ability to appreciate them is to be lost by neglect. On the other hand, no matter what Congresses and Committees, Academies and Faculties exist, they cannot *guarantee* the survival of art appreciation; for this is dependent on the very spirituality of humanity, and that the Church alone can preserve.

GILBERT N. WALTON.

SURVEYS

(A) SOME RECENT BOOKS ON ETHICS

THERE is no lack of diversity in the books to be noticed in this Survey. The problems of war, of marriage in the mission field, and of the Christian's attitude towards animals form the subjects of separate books: and there is one book covering the whole field of Christian morals.

In *Love : The One Solution* (Rich and Cowan, 3s. 6d.) Dr Herbert Gray writes briefly and attractively to support the contention expressed in his title. He writes as a pacifist who acknowledges his debt to Canon Sheppard, and does not minimize the difficulties of his undertaking. He says that it seems " we must either be traitors to truth as we know it, or be called traitors to our nations." His theodicy is based on the view that suffering is necessarily involved in a loving purpose of moral education, and he seems to interpret the Incarnation as being the declaration of a message of love. " Christianity has failed because it has never been Christ's Christianity." I find lacking here any recognition of a unique divine saving Act which makes the impossible possible; and if there is a weakness in the book it is here. Assertions that problems can be solved by love may be true, but they need grounding not only on an uncompromising summons to discipleship, but also on the proclamation of an Act of God. If this were present more explicitly in Dr Gray's book, his many wise sayings would be more securely based. And it is at least possible that the reason why they have this detached character lies somewhere in the fact that Dr Gray can write: " The doctrine that God and Christ are of the same substance has no illuminating power for our minds."

Natalie Victor, in *A Catholic looks at War* (James Clarke and Co., 2s. 6d.), would not, I am sure, agree with that opinion of Dr Gray's. To her that phrase of the creed certainly possesses " illuminating power," and she is at pains to express how that illumination has come to her " at the Altar, and before the Tabernacle." I think the book has been made weaker by its title. The word " catholic " is used in its narrower sense, yet the thought of most of the book would apply to all Christians, and of almost all of it to all Anglicans. And this rather one-sided use of language comes out in sentences such as: " The true Catholic is before all things a penitent." If there, and in many other places, one were to substitute " Christian " for " Catholic," both the argument and the effect of the book would have been stronger. The book has not the matured wisdom of Dr Gray's thought, but it has a foundation which his book seems to lack; and if the author's rather self-conscious " Catholicity " is disregarded, there is new and often valuable presentation of old material here.

In T. C. Hammond's *Perfect Freedom : An Introduction to Christian Ethics* (The Inter-Varsity Fellowship of Evangelical Unions, 5s.) one enters an entirely different field. How this book is published at the price of five shillings I cannot imagine. It runs to some 430 large pages of fairly small print, and is quite remarkable value for money. The book consists of four main sections with an introduction and a conclusion. There are also appendices giving a list of scripture references, a selection of questions for further thought and study, and a bibliography (if there is a second edition, the initials of some of the authors should be added, and also the publishers and the date of publication).

The author makes no secret of his point of view. " He is convinced that the focal point and controlling principle in an approach to the study of Ethics is the Sovereignty of God, who has revealed His will to man "; and of that revelation in Holy Scripture he gives the wise warning that " the Scriptures must be interpreted in the light of their context," and that the temptation must be resisted " to erect a sweeping generalization on the basis of one or two isolated texts."

In the introduction, after exhibiting the urgency of the study, he discusses its scope, and briefly considers differences between Natural and Christian Ethics, meeting the question whether there can be a distinctively Christian Ethics by the contention that " if it be scientific rigidly to exclude all reference to God and the supernatural when approaching the study of Ethics, then Christian Ethics must be adjudged to that extent ' unscientific,' " and by exhibiting the conceptions peculiar to a Christian view of Ethics—the chief of these being the place of the Person of Christ in the Christian system. " Christian Ethics is to be regarded as the study of the action of man in its relation to the Divine action."

The first main section of the book is called " Some Basic Problems." In this section Mr Hammond briefly discusses the nature of the moral self, and then considers the meaning of terms such as desire, will, motive, intention, character, conduct, judgment, and conscience. His discussion of the nature of conscience suffers from a certain obscurity (*e.g.*, pp. 66-67), and I did not feel that he had vindicated his claim that the conscience " really witnesses to Him who is higher than self."

The second section is a review in some eighty pages of Natural Ethics. I think that here the brevity of the survey is such as to make it sometimes almost misleading. It is true that Mr Hammond calls what he has to say " notes," and refers the student to the histories of Ethics, but that does not lessen the difficulty of what he has printed. Nor am I sure that he is quite fair in his discussion of casuistry.

The author is at his best in the third section, The Distinctive

Claim of Christian Ethics. Natural Ethics reckons without the supernatural, and he begins by showing the superiority of Christian Ethics by relating it to the assertions of Christian theology. He is concerned to emphasize the controlling effect of the Divine act and the Divine initiative regarded as facts, and insists that faith cannot be built on inner experience. Against such facts the New Birth, repentance, and the Divine Succour can be seen in their proper nature. There is a short chapter on the Divine Sovereignty, and then a discussion of the nature of man as a fallen being, and the effect of a conception of the fall on our reception of the findings of Natural Ethics. There follow two chapters which are the heart of this work—"The Significance of Christ—Justification by Faith" and "The Significance of the Holy Spirit—the Law of Liberty." The ethical teaching of Jesus is set in the context of the Christian's union with Christ; and that union finds its basis in the fact of His work of reconciliation, with its corollary in justification: "Men are content with amelioration, and do not press forward to the idea of regeneration," and "the foundation of Christian Ethics is found in the fact that we can accomplish nothing apart from the Divine initiative." The agent for this divine renewal is the Holy Spirit, who operates in every phase of the renewed heart's life. And so baptism and eucharist, prayer, and the study of the Scriptures enter directly into any discussion of Christian Ethics as ways in which the Spirit deals with men. The facts of the Divine revelation in general, and of atonement in particular, are prerequisites for the development of Christian ideals. Hence morality is one, and "there can be no division or degree in right conduct," and the problem of the apparently trivial remains as a pressure upon conscience.

In the fourth and longest section of his book Mr Hammond considers what he calls "the moral (Christian) life." Here in rapid survey he deals with the personal life of the Christian, with the relation of the Christian to the community, and then in order with moral institutions, sex relations, the family, the economic order, the state, the Church, and duties in regard to those of other race. It will not be expected that over such a range either the scale or the quality of the treatment will be uniform. But he writes wisely of the conception of vocation in Christian Ethics; of the importance of keeping abreast with the main lines of the development of knowledge, and of our responsibility to both past and future in this regard; and of the true character of the obligations to missionary activity. I do not feel that in his discussion of the complex society Mr Hammond attacks the problems presented by the fact of social stratification; and I was surprised to find no discussion of the principles on which a judgment about contraception is to be reached. Again, to stress the need for conversion, however true that may

be, is no answer to the problems presented by the economic order, and the injunction " to do all to the glory of God " is not sufficient reply to those who genuinely desire to do that, but who do not know what to do, nor how to discover what to do. I do not think he meets the possibility that the community and not the individual may be the primary unit, with all the social and economic consequences that that involves; and although his contention that " there is no valid ethical consideration which *compels* to pacifism " (italics mine) may be strictly true, I think he should have given more space to the discussion of the acute problem presented to the Christian by war.

In places the style of this book is laboured, and sometimes the author is unduly hesitant and self-depreciatory. There is not a little that I disagree with, but there is very much here which will provoke thought and stimulate moral judgment; and parish priests, study circles, and students in general will be grateful to Mr Hammond for his work, and to his publishers for making it available at such a low price.

Mr Hammond holds strong views about casuistry. He thinks it results in " a formal legalism more oppressive than that of the Pharisees " and in a " determination of conduct and practice which is the negation of all that we understand by ethical." He would not like G. Vromant 's *de Matrimonio* (l'Édition Universelle, Bruxelles; Desclée de Brouwer, Paris, 42 frs.). This forms one of the six volumes of the author's *Jus Missionariorum*, and a second revised edition was issued last year. It is a codified and minute treatment of the problems of marriage in the mission field, written for the guidance of Roman Catholic clergy. Reference is made to rulings and opinions relative to each one of the points discussed, and it would be difficult to formulate an example for which precise guidance was not laid down. Missionaries other than those of the Roman communion will find in this book much that may help them to think out the principles of Christian marriage, so that they may preserve its holy estate in the people committed to their charge.

Father Roche dedicates *These Animals of Ours* (Burns Oates and Washbourne, 3s. 6d.) to " the people next door who kindly allow their cat to have afternoon tea with his cat." It is a small but wise book, and a difficult subject is made interesting. His thesis is that " there is that in every animal, however humble, which demands a treatment quite above that accorded to a tree or a flower "; and that such " rights " as the animals possess " come to them by reason of their relationship first to their Creator and secondly to the whole created order." In the course of his argument many tracts of our present social order have their weaknesses exposed: the thought underlying the sentence " The rich man's ' sport ' is the poor man's ' cruelty ' " has many ramifications. Father Roche writes wisely of the place of the

suffering of animals in the wider mystery of pain, and of our responsibility for our invasion and dislocation of their natural territory; but his reasonableness is chiefly shown in his discussion of vivisection, and in the last chapter of the book, where he urges that while we may not " allow our humanitarian urges to go unchecked or to run riot," yet, in the treatment of animals, as in many other more important things, " our delicate yet holy task must be to conserve each good tendency in our times and not to alienate it."

The New Racial Paganism (Burns Oates and Washbourne, 3s. 6d.), by Mario Bendiscioli, was published in 1937, and is a brief account of the religious situation in Germany under the National Socialist régime. In the last two years much has happened which the author would have used to illustrate his study, but the book nevertheless remains a convenient short summary of facts which must engage the attention of both politicians and theologians trying to find landmarks for European reconstruction after the war.

From the same publishers comes *Self-Improvement*, by Professor R. Allers (5s.), of the Catholic University of America. The blurb describes it as being " written for the ordinary man as a practical aid to overcome the difficulties and troubles which arise from his own personality, and make him dissatisfied with himself." Its premises are Christian, though it is not a work either on religion or on morality. The author's purpose is so to summarize many years of observation as to " show to everyone that he knows already what is amiss with him, and that he knows the ways how to improve." The book is in three parts. The first is quite short, and considers the importance of, and the difficulties of achieving, that knowledge of self which is essential if both the need and the possibility of change and new beginnings are to be understood. The second, and longest, part examines, often in some detail, and with frequent illustration, some of the troubles and difficulties which beset our life. I doubt whether any reader will come to the end of this part without realizing better than he has before that there are a good many chinks in his armour. And the last part of the book is called " How to help Oneself." Here Professor Allers shows that true knowledge is the important first step, but that it is no more than a beginning. Knowing must be completed by doing, and " the first thing to do is to devote some thought to the interpretation of one's behaviour." And the book ends with what is really a discussion, in non-religious language, of self-examination, penitence, and amendment from which no little profit may be drawn.

H. C. L. Heywood.

(B) THE LITERATURE OF REUNION

If we attempted at all adequately to survey the field of reunion literature, even of that literature which deals directly with the subject, we should pass far beyond the limits of an article and overflow into a volume of considerable dimensions. In the Introduction to his invaluable work, *Christian Unity : A Bibliography*, M. Auguste Senaud says: " The titles included in this extract have been chosen from among some seven thousand titles relating to everything which refers to Christian Unity (history, exegesis, unceasingly renewed attempts through the ages, etc.). . . . We have restricted ourselves to giving titles of books which have an international character and which are relevant to the burning questions of to-day. We have taken the middle of the nineteenth century as our starting point. We have thus systematically left on one side all that went before that date—such as, for instance, the Tractarian Movement, whose literature would have considerably swelled these pages; literature concerning the rapprochement of Churches in individual countries; literature concerning the unification of Churches of the same type; the great discussions on the conception of the Church, its organization, dogmatics, etc." In spite of all these omissions, and the list might in fact be extended, M. Senaud has enumerated close on two thousand titles. His process of selection, too, is somewhat obscure, since he lists such a work as W. J. E. Bennett's *Foreign Churches in Relation to the Anglican* and omits G. F. Cobb's *A Few Words on Reunion and the Coming Council at Rome*; another strange omission being such a work as Fr A. G. Hebert's little book *Intercommunion*, though many books of that type are included. So that it may be readily appreciated that the literature on reunion is as vast as the subject itself.

A further difficulty to be faced is that a bare fraction of this literature—and that not usually classed as specifically " reunion literature "—is in any way authoritative in the sense of being binding upon anyone. The whole literature is a record of individual opinions and accounts of individual experiments. Even the various papal bulls and encyclicals included in Dr E. C. Messenger's book *Rome and Reunion*, although they have an especial significance for Roman Catholics, are not positively binding except, possibly, for the Bull *Apostolicæ Curæ* of Leo XIII. Indeed, a concrete example of this is shown in the letter of Pope Pius IX to the English Roman Bishops in 1864, condemning the Association for the Promotion of the Unity of Christendom, when, a few years later, full papal approval was given to an exactly similar organization, founded by the Barnabite Fr Tondini da Quarenghi.

We may, roughly speaking, divide reunion literature into five blocs: Works on the history of union and disunion; works giving individual opinions of the subject; official and semi-authoritative literature; reports of conferences and commissions; and periodical literature. This classification is of necessity very rough, since many works cut across the divisions we have made.

Works on the History of Union and Disunion.—It might, with some truth, be said that all works on Church history should be included under this heading, but there are a certain number of books dealing directly with the subject. Of the latter, possibly the best known, and certainly the most comprehensive, is that written by the American Presbyterian, Dr G. J. Slosser, *Christian Unity : Its History and Challenge.* The book deals specifically with unions achieved or attempted rather than with divisions, and takes the story from the Council of Jerusalem in 49 to the Missionary Conference at Jerusalem in 1928. The book is written, on the whole, in an unbiased and scholarly manner and contains a certain amount of out-of-the-way information, such as the history of the unfortunate Order of Corporate Reunion. A smaller book, covering the same great period, is M. André Paul's *L'Unité Chrétienne : Schismes et Rapprochements*, of which 150 pages are devoted to schisms and a little more than 200 to the history of reconciliations. Part of the work appears to be based on a very valuable book, now unfortunately very rare, *Histoire critique des projets formés depuis trois cents ans pour la réunion des communions chrétiennes*, by Père Tabaraud, published in Paris in 1824.

Three useful books on modern reunion movements hail from the United States. The most interesting is that compiled by Dr H. Paul Douglass and prepared at the request of the Commission on the Church's Unity in Life and Worship for the Edinburgh Conference; it is entitled *A Decade of Objective Progress in Church Unity, 1927-1936.* The scope of this work is defined by its author as follows: " The present report then traces the progress of a decade of objective unity of the sort which aims at or involves formal ecclesiastical readjustments. Its main body of material consists of a series of brief case-studies exhibiting the different phases of unity of this sort. Some fifty-five cases in all are presented, in addition to selected examples of general propaganda and discussion." A much more bulky, but far less useful, book by the same author is *Church Unity Movements in the United States*, and another book giving an account of the various American reunion movements and societies is Dr Frederick Lynch's Olaus Petri Lectures, delivered in 1922, *The Christian Unity Movement in America.* These works which we have quoted are the most useful and best-informed of the general histories of unity, but, as may be imagined, each separate rapprochement and each separate division has an entire literature of its own.

Works giving Individual Opinions of the Subject.—These are, of course, legion and of very varying degrees of worth; they vary from tracts to treatises and from works of high value and scholarship to works not worth the paper they are printed on. Few works on reunion, other than historical or authoritative (in the sense of being binding upon the communions from which they issue) ones, are likely to be of permanent value; they may influence a few people, make them pray or think more deeply on the subject, and their purpose thus fulfilled will fall into obscurity. Such has been the fate, for example, of Dr Döllinger's *Reunion of the Churches*, Father Duggan's *Steps towards Reunion*, Lord Halifax's *Call to Reunion*, the various works of Dr F. G. Lee or even the comparatively recent *Catholic Plea for Reunion* of Father Gille, all of which works made some stir when first published. Some works, of course, retain their value either permanently or at least for a considerable period. Dr Headlam's Bampton Lectures on *The Doctrine of the Church and Christian Reunion* are probably still widely read, although delivered nearly twenty years ago. The same is true of Spencer Jones's *England and the Holy See*, a book which made a great sensation when first published at the beginning of this century, which was translated into German and reviewed in every country in Europe. Dr T. A. Lacey's *Unity and Schism* is still read and may survive, while those who look for reunion with the East will continue to read Khomiakoff's *L'Eglise latine et le protestantisme au point de vue de l'Eglise d'Orient*, Pierling's *Rome et Moscou*, Soloviev's *La Russie et l'Eglise universelle*, Canon J. A. Douglas's *The Relations of the Anglican Churches with the Eastern Orthodox* or Dr S. H. Scott's *The Eastern Churches and the Papacy*. Modern books that may live for any length of time are few indeed. Probably the most significant modern book on reunion is Père Congar's *Chrétiens Désunis*, recently translated under the title of *Divided Christendom*. Dr Goudge's *Church of England and Reunion* may live on account of the large amount of learning packed into it. Dr Adolf Keller's *Der Weg der dialektischen Theologie durch die kirchliche Welt*, translated into English under the title of *Karl Barth and Christian Unity*, and the articles of Barth himself, translated and published in book form under the title of *The Church and the Churches*, will be read so long as Barthianism is a living force.

Official and Semi-authoritative Literature.—This comprises little more than the various confessional declarations of various communions. It might be said to include the *Acta* of the various Ecumenical Councils, which the Roman Church regards as binding and the first four of which the Canon of 1571 binds upon the Church of England. The section would also include such works as the Quaker pamphlet, *The True Basis of Christian Unity*; the various replies contained in *Convictions*; many of the

documents in the Bishop of Chichester's *Documents on Christian Unity, 1929-1930*, an indispensable book; such pamphlets as Dr G. Ohlemüller's *Die römisch-Katholische Kirche u. die ökumenische Bewegung der Neuzeit*, and other publications prepared by various Churches for the two Conferences of 1937 or the other Ecumenical gatherings. The section also includes the work of Dr Messenger, referred to above. While these various works, and many more, may be regarded as official, in that they are put forth by their various Churches in an official manner, they are not binding even upon the communions concerned. The works of Roman Catholics are difficult to classify, since, in most cases, they are published under *Imprimatur*, and have thus to conform to a certain extent to a pattern. Thus all " imprimatured " books may be regarded as semi-official and expressing the mind of Rome, though that mind may take on various aspects, as is seen in the difference of outlook between, for example, Father Leslie Walker's *Problem of Reunion* and the work of Congar, or between the essay of Cardinal Bourne prefixed to *Mortalium Animos* in Sir James Marchant's *Reunion of Christendom* and the Abbé Couturier's *Universal Prayer of Christians for Christian Unity*. This section also includes the Lambeth Encyclicals and the findings of the Lambeth Conferences.

Reports of Conferences and Commissions.—These are rapidly becoming legion. Many of them are preserved in the work of the Bishop of Chichester, already mentioned, and it is greatly to be hoped that he will continue the work from 1930-1940 to include many more. It is not often that anyone apart from the research worker can be induced to read a report of anything, which is unfortunate in this instance, since reports form an important part of reunion literature and occasionally make interesting reading. *The Conversations at Malines*, edited by the late Lord Halifax, for instance, is a work of considerable interest, and *Faith and Order*, 1927, and the corresponding report of the Edinburgh Conference contain far more of interest than appears at first sight. The advantage of dull reports is that they are generally not very long, and the interest of a report will often increase in proportion as the proceedings are reported more fully.

Periodical Literature.—It is immensely heartening, or heart-rending, if one chooses to regard it in that light, to note how many periodicals are, and have been, devoted solely to the cause of reunion. In England alone we have *Reunion*, *The Christian East*, *The Eastern Churches Quarterly*, *The Pilot*, *Sobornost*, and *Œcumenica*, all devoted solely to the cause of reunion. While on the Continent there is *Irénikon*, *Der Christliche Orient*, *L'Oriente cristiano e l'Unità della Chiesa*, and *L'Unité de l'Eglise*, to mention only the better-known ones. In the past various reunion magazines have appeared, to flourish for a time and to become

seems unwilling in considering his third problem—that of the modern concept of moral defect—to admit that emotional conflict may be the cause of lack of moral sense. He does, it is true, admit that " there are some whose conduct is possibly the result of a definite psychoneurosis." He then goes on to say (p. 167): " It is undoubtedly true that there are a few cases who are neither mental defectives in the ordinary sense of the word nor neurotics, yet who from a comparatively early age display a persistent all-round behaviour which cannot be corrected either by kindness or severe discipline. This is the real problem of conduct disorder, and it is for this that a true psychological explanation is sought."

He continues: " I am aware that many medical psychologists of certain schools would seek an explanation in the unconscious life of these individuals, but I have not deemed it necessary or *desirable* [italics mine] to discuss this problem specifically in the light of modern developments in psychology associated with the names of Freud, Adler, Jung and others." For this curious conclusion three reasons are given: the first is that all these psychologists are determinists, the second is that the psychotherapists of these schools " who hold that the unconscious is essentially amoral and governed by the egotistical pleasure-pain principle, would not in general lend any support to the notion of ' moral defect ' which has been discussed and criticized in these pages." The third reason is—" Freudianism and its derivatives do not appear to make any contribution, that would otherwise be lacking, to a solution of the problem under review. A satisfactory explanation, and one that is consistent with the traditional notions of moral responsibility, can be found in the theory of a temperamental defective." This term is derived from Dr Cyril Burt and is said to depend to a large degree upon a " marked emotionality." But we may not consider whether the individual displays a " marked emotionality " because of some factor in the unconscious mind ! That might conflict with the traditional notions of moral responsibility, which apparently take no account of the work of modern psychology.

I must confess to having but little sympathy with the author of this book, for he wants to have it both ways: to appear to be making scientific investigation and also to square his findings with his own preconceived ideas.

LEONARD F. BROWNE.

YOUTH IN ACTION. Edited by H. C. Warner. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

The title of this book is not entirely appropriate, as its contents should be the concern of church-people of all ages.

Fr Hebert begins with a brilliant essay on " Evangelism and

Worship," in which he insists upon the supreme importance of the parish Eucharist as the one liturgical service which truly represents the oblation of the worshipping community. This theme he has worked out more fully elsewhere; but what may have been lost in this instance by brevity is more than compensated for by a refreshing clarity. Some will feel that he deals too exclusively with the Communion service and will wish that he had found room to comment upon other forms of worship; for although a Youth Group will always strive to centre its life around the altar, yet it will continually have to deal with young men and women to whom the Eucharist is not the norm of worship. No one who is concerned for evangelism wants " popular services," but there is a case to be made out for simple acts of worship, centring around the Ministry of the Word, which will help to educate the uninitiated.

This, however, is a small criticism, and is not intended to minimize the general value of Fr Hebert's essay, which, in itself, makes the book well worth buying.

Mr A. M. Ramsey supplies a most helpful article on " What is the Gospel ?" In it he presents the approach which has become associated with the name of Professor C. H. Dodd. This he does in the simplest possible manner, and in doing so provides the material for study and discussion which any youth fellowship will find necessary.

No doubt many of his readers will wish that he had developed his theme to the extent of showing how the Gospel can be correlated to the affairs of the contemporary situation in which the people for whom the book is intended find themselves placed.

Miss Evelyn Underhill reminds us that " a daily rule of prayer maintained in the teeth of all obstacles and supported by some Bible reading and simple meditation, is the first duty of those who wish to work for the kingdom of God." She follows this with some useful practical hints on " the secret loving intercourse of each Christian soul with God." No doubt to those advanced in the art of prayer her remarks will seem quite elementary, but to those who are aware of the generally low ebb of prayer-life it will be feared that much of what she says will seem too involved.

The other essays are mediocre, though they all contain information which some groups will find helpful. Mr T. R. Milford has considerable knowledge of study-circles, and he shows how they can best be conducted.

Mr T. H. Baxter provides a complete chronicle of appropriate films, while a subsequent writer illustrates the worth of religious drama.

Four essays are devoted to social service, and Mr. J. F. L. Durham provides a useful list of possible occupations. This is no doubt extremely valuable for ambulance work, but in these

days most young people are asking for guidance much more definite and radical than this. Our present social system is at root either in conformity with God's will or it is not. If not, what are church-people to do about it? This is a difficult problem, and it is one which the book makes no attempt to solve, in spite of its somewhat militant title.

Perhaps the least satisfactory feature of *Youth in Action* is that it seems to be blissfully unaware of the precarious position in which the Church in this country is placed.

MERVYN STOCKWOOD.

DEATH IS NOT ENOUGH. By Michael Fraenkel. Daniel. 7s. 6d.

It is strange that in an age of battle, murder, and sudden death—when anthologies are about as common as bombs—that nobody has thought of producing an anthology of death. Not only would it certainly be a best seller, but it would provide a faithless generation with the food for which it has so keen an appetite. Nevertheless, our preoccupation with the shadows is not altogether faithless, or even unhealthy; and Mr Fraenkel's variations on the theme of death may be said to be actually creative. There is a smell of the earth about it; but it is the good rich smell of the creative earth. Death is a problem which has disturbed the minds of many; but Mr Fraenkel sees in a refusal to deny death its rights and natural heritage the first stage of the victory that must finally overcome it.

In the first part of his book he analyses the disintegrating quality of our own age—in life as in literature—and the domination of final inertia in the realm of material existence. This theme, so typical of the best in Æschylus, Hardy, Beethoven, and Shakespeare, can hardly be developed impressively in fifty pages; but Mr Fraenkel does lay some of the evolutionary bogeys and summon to his aid the complex organism of modern society of whatever kind to show us where the real disease, the real putrefaction, abides. There is but a step from this to the vision of death as experienced by some of the greatest minds within the complex of modern society; and, in what is quite the best chapter of the book, we get some glimpses of the modern poet at work upon the social system that is in process of disruption. For poetry is, of course, the sensitive core of contemporary thought; and Mr Fraenkel would seem to reach in the mental climate the white heart-rot of death.

The flight of D. H. Lawrence from death to the vision of his own dark, elemental sun is a piece of good writing, typical of Mr Fraenkel's searching analysis and keen-edged perception of what is wrong with the world. He sees in Lawrence the symptom of a generation brought to its peak, an heroic deter-

mination not to be heroes that is so typical of a disillusioned age. Wyndham Lewis, Pirandello, Anton Tchekov, and Aldous Huxley have all at some time championed that cause; but Lawrence was martyred in it. So he has become the prototype of a generation; and wisely and carefully does Mr Fraenkel handle that delicate and complex mind. His book concludes with a restatement of the problem in terms of a dramatic conception; we are bidden to face death as something like bad weather—something that we cannot change but can at least live out. This may not be unfairly regarded as a reaction from the unheroic attitude to death of which Lawrence was the supreme example into something that may be sublimated into the doctrine of the resurrection.

It must not be supposed from all this that Mr Fraenkel's book is primarily a set of literary studies—even of death; and the last thing his book may be called is an excursion through this valley of shadows. It is, in substance, a recall to the realist position of regarding death as a solid and objective reality. It is regarded as part of the pattern of the material universe, not as a mere abstraction; and its haunting refrain throughout Mr Fraenkel's crisp prose gains for his book the quality of a Beethoven quartet that owes as much to its temperament as to its size. This is, in fact, a book that makes a real contribution to a problem that has been the vital spot of creative activity since the dawn of thought.

ASHLEY SAMPSON.

A COMPREHENSIVE CHURCH. Edited by H. D. A. Major. Blackwell. 3s. 6d.

The title of this year's Modern Churchman's Conference Report is somewhat misleading. The emphasis at any rate is on the adjective rather than the noun, on the desirability of doctrinal latitude within the Church rather than on the rediscovery of what the Church really is. Of the fourteen papers, not one deals with the Church or its comprehensiveness in the New Testament, which is surely surprising in a society which stresses the modern critical study of the Bible; and the two which take as their subjects respectively The Idea of a Comprehensive Church and its Ministry and Sacraments will seem to many the least satisfactory of all.

The first of these is Sir Cyril Norwood's Presidential address. Its value lies chiefly in its being a clear expression of the point of view, as he says, of the " ordinary educated layman," and of one who feels the urgency of the situation. " The hard fact is that nationalism is everywhere stronger than Christianity." But the suggested remedy is surprising. It is assumed that " the Church is the nation on its religious side," and that a truly comprehensive Church must first be national; once that,

it can move on to federation with other churches. The view that the Church of England and the nation are coterminous, which appears elsewhere in the Report, was understandable in Hooker's day. That it is not actually true now Sir Cyril would attribute to the Church's intolerance. May not deeper causes be that the Church has been too nationalistic for many sensitive souls, and that it has acted on the belief, which Sir Cyril endorses, that Christianity is chiefly a Way of Life, and that such things as Church Order and Sacraments are " human accretions " to the " simple Gospel "? This failure to take seriously the New Testament's insistence on the Church as being itself " a holy nation, a peculiar people," an objective organism with a visible structure of its own, can be seen in many of these papers, but in none is it more obvious than in that of the Bishop of St Edmundsbury and Ipswich, on The Ministry and Sacraments of a Comprehensive Church. He accepts the Congregational principle of the validity of any ministry acceptable to the body of Christians it serves; he presses for general Intercommunion as a means to a federation of the churches; and—most revealing of all—he would like to eliminate from the two Gospel Sacraments all traces of the Old Testament and its spirit, and in particular the concept of the Wrath of God. His paper ends with a misquotation of Matthew xxiii, 23.

Among the many papers which discuss with approval various aspects of the recent Doctrinal Report, the most helpful is Professor Creed's. Taking Christology as his subject, he deals in some detail with the use of the word " symbol " in the Report and Fr Hebert's criticism of it. One feels the need of further clarification here, especially on the relation of " symbol " to " myth "—as in the " myth of the Fall "—and the different use of the word when it is applied, for example, to the Sacraments. We forget too easily the original meaning of the word which it translates. As Harnack puts it, " What we nowadays understand by ' symbol ' is a thing which is not that which it represents; at that time a ' symbol ' denoted a thing which in some kind of way really is what it signifies." There is still too much ambiguity in such common phrases as " a symbolic interpretation of the Creeds." This may partly be due to a conception of the Creeds chiefly as tests of orthodoxy, of which Mr Henderson's paper is an example. As such he finds them inadequate, as leading " a burdensome and boring old age." But should the Creeds be so regarded, as scholastic definitions, as exclusive tests of orthodoxy isolated from the whole structure of the Church? F. D. Maurice was probably nearer the truth when he called them " a defence of the scriptures and of the poor man against the attempts of doctors to confuse the one and rob the other."

It is hard to generalize about a collection of discourses so varied in subject and quality, but behind many of them there

does seem to lie one fatal weakness, a disregard for what *is* in favour of what *might be*. Consideration of what the Church should be crowds out the prior consideration of what it actually is. True, it cannot be content to remain a minority Church. But will it become more attractive simply by being more comprehensive? May it not first have to be more recognizable? If there is not an unmistakable community, definite in its faith and distinctive in its life, it is hard to see how, as we approach a situation not altogether unlike that of the Church in Germany, the majority of Anglican Churchmen will not find themselves "English Christians."

A. G. Hort.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

Allen and Unwin: S. Radhakrishnan, *Mahatma Gandhi* (7s. 6d.).

Burns Oates and Washbourne: M. René-Bazin, *My Sisters Pass By* (5s.); H. Van Zeller, *Liturgical Asides* (3s. 6d.); G. Vann, O.P., *Morality and War* (3s. 6d.); The People and Freedom Group, *For Democracy* (8s. 6d.).

Centenary Press: L. Sturzo, *Church and State* (21s.); W. B. Selbie, *Christianity and the New Psychology* (3s. 6d.); W. N. Pittenger, *The Approach to Christianity* (3s. 6d.).

C.L.A.: *A Litany of the Name of Jesus* (1d.).

Clarendon Press: Sir W. David Ross, *Foundations of Ethics* (Gifford Lectures, 1935-6) (15s.); Carleton Brown (Ed.), *Religious Lyrics of the Fifteenth Century* (10s. 6d.); R. C. Mortimer, *The Origins of Private Penance in the Western Church* (10s. 6d.).

Constable: Naomi Mitchison, *The Blood of the Martyrs* (8s. 6d.).

Faber and Faber: C. T. Dimont and F. de Witt Batty, *St Clair Donaldson* (12s. 6d.); B. Walke, *Plays from St Hilary* (2s. 6d.).

Longmans: R. L. Ashcroft, *The Divine Scheme* (3s. 6d.).

Mowbrays: S. Harton, *The Practice of Intercession* (2s. 6d.).

Nelson: *Robert Lynd's Anthology of Modern Poetry* (7s. 6d.).

Oxford University Press: R. G. Collingwood, *An Autobiography* (7s. 6d.).

Sheed and Ward: J. P. Arendzen, *The Holy Trinity* (3s. 6d., reissue); M. Zundel, *The Splendour of the Liturgy* (7s. 6d.).

Sheldon Press: W. and D. Kendrick, *Stories of Jesus—I* (10d.).

S.P.C.K.: T. G. Edwards, *Evolution and Christian Belief* (4s.); H. S. Box (Ed.), *The Priest as Student* (8s. 6d.); P. Graham, *Christopher* (5s.); C. P. S. Warren, *Stories for Timothy* (3s. 6d.); *Prayers at the Eucharist* (2s.); A. E. G. M., *The King and the Kingdom* (2s.); A. E. Henderson, *Some Yorkshire Abbeys, Then and Now* (6s.); T. H. Sutcliffe, *The Book of Amos* (1s. 9d.); E. Evans, *The New Testament* (2s. 6d.) and *The Apocrypha* (1s.); A. G. Hebert, *Unity in the Truth* (1s.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher